



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

1994

Teachers' Expectations and Perceptions of the Discipline Effectiveness of the Male and Female Dean

Kathryn J. Robbins
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Robbins, Kathryn J., "Teachers' Expectations and Perceptions of the Discipline Effectiveness of the Male and Female Dean" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 4057.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/4057

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1994 Kathryn J. Robbins

**TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE
DISCIPLINE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MALE AND FEMALE DEAN**

by

Kathryn J. Robbins

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Education of Loyola University of
Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education**

May

1994

TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MALE AND FEMALE DEAN

by Kathryn J. Robbins

ABSTRACT

Much research has been done regarding the effectiveness of women in school leadership, although most of the research has focused on women in principalships or superintendencies.

Hassan Esau Mamma's Ed.D. dissertation, written in 1987 at George Washington University, measured teachers' attitudes toward women's ability to succeed in school administrative positions. The data showed that women were given "favorable ratings in almost all factors considered necessary for success in school administration, except for emotional and stress factors. These factors were considered key for school discipline, and therefore it was thought that women could not cope with school behavioral management." This study directly measures the accuracy of that conclusion.

Through the use of a survey instrument administered to randomly selected teachers in five public DuPage County and Cook County secondary schools, the researcher assessed teachers' expectations for discipline in their school and then their perceptions of the disciplinary actions of female and male deans whose primary responsibility is discipline. Using the measures of expectations and perceptions, the researcher derived a correlation regarding the effectiveness of male versus female deans in charge of discipline.

The first step of the analysis of the data involved deriving a measure of discipline effectiveness for the female and male dean of each participating school on six dimensions: Task/Initiating Structure, Caring Personal

Characteristics, Relationships, Cultural Leadership, Personal Challenge, and Quality Leadership. This effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean, on each dimension. Then the mean discipline effectiveness score was obtained for each school as well as for the total sample.

After six mean measures of effectiveness were obtained for each dean, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance was used to compare males and females on each of the six dimensions. This analysis was performed for each school, as well as for the total sample.

The results for the total sample indicate that female and male deans were rated significantly different on three of the six dimensions, Task/Initiating, Caring Personal Characteristics and Relationships. While female deans were rated significantly more effective on the Task/Initiating dimension, male deans were rated significantly more effective on the Caring Personal Characteristics and Relationships dimensions.

This study revealed that overall female deans perform as capably in their job responsibilities as do male deans. It is hoped that a growing number of women will apply for positions as secondary school deans. Women in these positions can accomplish four things: 1) they can perform their job duties effectively, 2) they can take a first step into the ranks of school administration, 3) they can serve as role models for other women in the teaching profession as well as for female students, and 4) they can help to break down gender-based stereotypes and biases.

It is further hoped that secondary school administrators responsible for hiring deans will more often expand their search to include women.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely grateful for the generous support provided to me by so many people as I completed this dissertation. In particular, I wish to thank Dr. L. Arthur Safer, the director of this dissertation, for his constant encouragement, wisdom, and good humor. I also wish to express my gratitude to the members of my committee, Dr. Max Bailey and Dr. Philip Carlin, for their constructive criticism and kind words. My sincere gratitude extends to Ms. Lisa Lisnov, whose statistical expertise and assistance were critical to this study. Finally, a heartfelt thank you to Dr Willis Furtwengler of the Research Service Institute for the use of his survey instrument and his helpful advice.

In addition, I could not have completed this project without the support of my good friends and colleagues at both Glenbard West High School and Leyden Township High Schools. Their limitless support, understanding, and patience in providing me with the time and energy to complete this study are debts too great to ever repay in kind.

Finally, and most important, a special loving acknowledgment to my family. To my parents, Rae and Bill Fisher, for always standing quietly in my corner. To my daughter, Allyson, and my husband, Michael, for their love and belief in what I could accomplish.

VITA

Kathryn Jane Robbins was born and raised in Rockford, Illinois and is the daughter of William and Rachel Fisher. She is married to J. Michael Robbins and has one daughter, Allyson Goetschel.

The author received her elementary education at Guilford Center and her secondary education at Guilford High School, both in Rockford. She received her Bachelor's degree from Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, Illinois, majoring in Business Education.

During her teaching career, she taught at Manteno High School, Manteno, Illinois and Proviso East High School in Maywood, Illinois. She received her Master's degree in Education from National-Louis University in Evanston, Illinois in 1987. From 1989-1993, she was Assistant Dean of Students at Glenbard West High School in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. In 1991, she entered the doctoral program at Loyola University in the College of Education in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. She is presently employed as Assistant Principal of West Leyden High School in Northlake, Illinois.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

A	Personal Data Form for Survey Respondents	151
B	Letter Seeking Permission from Author of Survey	152
C	Letter from Author of Survey Giving Permission	153
D	<u>Basic Leadership Profile</u> , Part I, Expectations	154
E	<u>Basic Leadership Profile</u> , Part II, Perceptions	156
F	Letter to Area Principals Seeking Permission	158
G	Cover Letter to Principals Involved in Survey	159
H	Cover Letter to Teachers Completing Survey	160
I	Thank You Letter to Principals	161

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

1	Survey Return Rate (By School)	37
2	Personal Data (Total Sample)	39
3	Personal Data (School A)	40
4	Personal Data (School B)	41
5	Personal Data (School C)	42
6	Personal Data (School D)	43
7	Personal Data (School E)	44
8	Length of Time in Dean's Position (By School)	45
	Task/Initiating Structure	
9	Expectation of Deans	55
10	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	56
11	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	57
12	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	58
13	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	59
14	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	62
	Caring Personal Characteristics	
15	Expectation of Deans	66
16	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	67
17	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	68
18	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	69
19	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	70
20	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	72

	Relationships	
21	Expectation of Deans	76
22	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	77
23	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	78
24	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	80
25	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	81
26	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	83
	Cultural Leadership	
27	Expectation of Deans	87
28	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	88
29	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	89
30	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	91
31	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	92
32	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	94
	Personal Challenge	
33	Expectation of Deans	97
34	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	99
35	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	101
36	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	103
37	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	104
38	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	106
	Quality Leadership	
39	Expectation of Deans	110
40	Perceptions of Selected Female Deans	111
41	Perceptions of Selected Male Deans	112
42	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions	114
43	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By School)	115
44	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (By Female and Male Respondent)	117

45	Basic Leadership Profile -- Expectations (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Question)	122
46	Basic Leadership Profile -- Perceptions of Female Deans (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Question)	125
47	Basic Leadership Profile -- Perceptions of Male Deans (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Question)	128
48	Comparison of Expectations and Perceptions (By Cluster)	131
49	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (Total Sample, By Cluster)	132
50	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	133
51	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans, School A (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	134
52	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans, School B (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	135
53	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans, School C (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	136
54	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans, School D (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	137
55	Effectiveness of Female and Male Deans, School E (Total Sample, By Cluster, By Female and Male Respondents)	138

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF APPENDICES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Definition of the Terms	4
Hypotheses	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Organization of the Study	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
The Aims of School Discipline and its Impact on Climate	12
Gender and Leadership	22
III. METHODOLOGY	35
Design of the Study	35
Sample Selections	36
Subjects	45
Instrument	46
Administration of the Survey	48
Analysis of the Data	49
Summary	50

IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	52
	Analysis of the Data	52
	Hypothesis I	54
	Hypothesis II	65
	Hypothesis III	75
	Hypothesis IV	86
	Hypothesis V	96
	Hypothesis VI	109
	Summary	119
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	140
	The Problem	140
	The Purpose	141
	The Hypotheses	141
	The Instrument	142
	Data Analysis	144
	Conclusions	145
	Implications for Practice	146
	Recommendations	147
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	148
	APPENDIX A	151
	APPENDIX B	152
	APPENDIX C	153
	APPENDIX D	154
	APPENDIX E	156
	APPENDIX F	158
	APPENDIX G	159
	APPENDIX H	160
	APPENDIX I	161
	APPROVAL SHEET	162

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine whether gender plays a role in discipline effectiveness in the secondary schools. Many dissertations have been written and much research has been done regarding the effectiveness of women in school leadership, although most of the research has focused on women in principalships and/or superintendencies.

Fishel and Pottker conducted studies in the 1970's that concluded that female principals generally perform more capably than male principals. In 1975, Fishel and Pottker stated, "These behavioral studies clearly indicate that in terms of ability to supervise and administer a school and to maintain good relations with students and parents, the few women who have been able to obtain administrative positions have performed as capably as, if not more capably than, their male counterparts."¹ They also stated that "women principals displayed greater respect for the dignity of the teachers in their schools, had better and closer

¹ A. Fishel and J. Pottker, "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies", National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors Journal. 54 (Spring, 1975): 113.

communication with the teachers, maintained a more closely knit organization, were more effective at resolving conflicts with staff members, were better at reconciling conflicting demands, exercised stronger leadership, and generally exhibited more effective administrative techniques."²

In a 1979 study by S. L. Tibbets, the conclusion was that "Parents looked more favorably on schools with women principals, were more involved in school affairs, and approved more often of the learning activities and outcomes in the schools headed by women."³

Hassan Esau Mamma provided another viewpoint of the effectiveness of women by measuring teachers' perceptions toward women's ability to succeed in school administrative positions. The data showed that women were given "favorable ratings in almost all factors considered necessary for success in school administration, except for emotional and stress factors. These factors were considered key for school discipline, and therefore it was thought that women could not cope with school behavioral management."⁴ This was the only study found that

² Fishel, 114.

³ S. L. Tibbets, "Why Don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education?" In Berry, M.C. (Ed.) *Women in Higher Education: A Book of Readings*. (Washington, DC: The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1979), 106.

⁴ Hassan Esau Mamma, "A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers and School Administrators Toward Women's Ability to Succeed in School Administrative Positions" (Ed.D. diss., The George Washington University, 1987), 93.

directly measured effectiveness with regard to discipline, and the results were not positive.

Willis Furtwengler in his book, Improving School Discipline: An Administrator's Guide, defines discipline as "the processes designed to aid students in developing social behaviors and attitudes for appropriate participation in an adult democratic culture."⁵ He claims that the personality or climate of a school is related to the development of appropriate student behaviors and is included in this definition of discipline. He defines effectiveness generally as the achievement of one or more desired expectations. With regard to discipline, such expectations are defined as those aspirations for discipline that a person believes ought to or should occur. Effectiveness, then, is the extent to which it is perceived that expectations are met.⁶

This dissertation examined the accuracy of the conclusion that women are not as effective as men with regard to discipline. This was accomplished through the employment of a survey instrument administered in five selected public, suburban secondary schools. The survey measured teachers' expectations for a person in the dean's position as well as teachers' perceptions of their own school's male and female

⁵ Willis J. Furtwengler and William Konnert, Improving School Discipline: An Administrator's Guide. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1982), 4.

⁶ Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 5.

deans. The deans' primary responsibility in each case is student discipline. Through the measures of expectations and perceptions, the researcher derived a correlation of effectiveness.

Definition of the Terms

Conducting this study required a clarification of several terms used within this body of research.

Administration is defined as "all those techniques and procedures employed in operating the educational organization in accordance with established policies."⁷

Administrative effectiveness is defined as "the extent to which satisfactory results have been produced through the control, direction, and management exercised by the executive authorities; satisfactory results should be judged in terms of the objectives of the activities".⁸

High school, used synonymously with secondary school, is defined as "the school division following the elementary school, comprising most often grades 9 to 12."⁹

⁷ Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), 14.

⁸ Good, 15.

⁹ Good, 47.

High school dean is defined as "the professional responsible for the general administration of student personnel services in a high school. Social, educational, vocational, and other guidance (including discipline) services are generally a part of his/her responsibilities. The scope and extent of each dean's tasks are determined by individual school districts and/or the administrative structure of the high school."¹⁰

School discipline is the "characteristic degree and kind of orderliness in a given school or the means by which that order is obtained; the maintenance of conditions conducive to the efficient achievement of the school's functions."¹¹

Discipline is defined as "the roles of principals, teachers, parents and students in establishing and implementing a discipline program, as well as the program itself--the processes designed to aid students in developing social behaviors and attitudes for appropriate participation in an adult democratic culture. The personality or climate of a school is related to the development of appropriate student behaviors and is included in this definition of discipline."¹²

¹⁰ Edward L. Dejnozka and David E. Kapel, American Educators' Encyclopedia. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 158.

¹¹ Good, 92.

¹² Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 4.

Expectations is defined as "those aspirations that a person believes ought to or should occur."¹³

Perceptions is defined as "one's knowledge, understanding, belief, or understanding of any given situation."¹⁴

Effectiveness "generally implies the achievement of one or more desired expectations. With regard to discipline, such expectations are defined as those aspirations for discipline that a person believes ought to or should occur. Effectiveness, then, is the extent to which it is perceived that expectations are met."¹⁵

Discipline effectiveness is defined as "a concern for the extent to which school-related people and the program in a school are helping the students learn expected social behaviors, attitudes, and personal characteristics."¹⁶

Task/Initiating Structure is defined as the extent to which the administrator recognizes and defines reality, identifies and solves problems, sets reasonable goals, takes actions, and focuses attention on the organization.¹⁷

¹³ Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 4.

¹⁴ Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 5.

¹⁵ Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 5-6.

¹⁶ Furtwengler, Improving School Discipline, 6.

¹⁷ Willis J. Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile, Wichita, Kansas: Research and Service Institute, 1986.

Caring Personal Characteristics is defined as the extent to which the administrator is viewed as: 1) being warm and caring, sensitive, open, and 2) having a sense of values and trust of others.¹⁸

Relationships is defined as the extent to which the administrator: 1) listens to others, 2) recognizes the work of others, 3) shares decision-making with others, 4) is firm and consistent, and 5) is willing to examine his/her own actions. It also is the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of: 1) trust and respect for individual integrity, 2) warmth and caring among individuals, and 3) fairness and empowerment.¹⁹

Cultural Leadership is defined as the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains others' commitments to the aims, goals, and mission of the organization. It also is the extent to which the administrator helps others develop a sense of community and maintain a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.²⁰

Personal Challenge is defined as the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment for helping others

18 Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile.

19 Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile.

20 Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile.

develop personal and professional aims that lead to a sense of independence, responsibility, and selflessness.²¹

Quality Leadership is defined as the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of self-improvement, organizational improvement, and commitment to learning.²²

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this study are stated in the null form:

- I. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to task/initiating structure, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- II. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to caring personal characteristics, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- III. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to relationships, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

²¹ Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile.

²² Furtwengler, Basic Leadership Profile.

- IV. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to cultural leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- V. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to personal challenge, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- VI. There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to quality leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Limitations of the Study

The responses from the survey process were limited to a small number of participants in a specific geographical area, i.e. DuPage County and suburban Cook County, in Illinois. The population from which this sample was drawn was restricted to selected public, secondary schools that employ both a male and a female dean of discipline. Caution must be taken when generalizations are made so that they only apply to the representative population. Implications should not be extended beyond the sample as a question of reliability could arise. Any conclusions drawn

should be limited to the expectations and perceptions of the discipline effectiveness of the male and female dean as evidenced by a random sampling of these selected schools' faculties and not to other secondary schools' faculties in these or other counties in the state.

Finally, consideration of faculty respondents' personal biases and stereotypes with regard to gender must look beyond the responses offered in order to assess the veracity of the answers provided.

Organization of the Study

This study reflected the expectations and perceptions of selected DuPage and Cook County secondary school teachers with regard to the discipline effectiveness of male and female discipline deans.

The study was organized into five chapters: Chapter I includes the purpose of the study, a definition of the terms, hypotheses of the study, and limitations of the study. Chapter II contains a review of related literature, focusing on the aims of school discipline and its importance to school climate as well as gender implications in school administration. Chapter III presents the design of the study as well as the methodology used to analyze the data. Chapter IV is an analysis of the data collected through the use of the survey instrument. Chapter V is a discussion and summary of the problem, the purpose, the hypotheses, the research instrument, an analysis of the data, findings of the study, implications for practice, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Review of Related Literature focused on two areas: (1) the aims of school discipline and its impact on school climate, and (2) gender and leadership.

The Aims of School Discipline and its Impact on Climate

What is the role of discipline in the schools? Is order important primarily because it facilitates teaching? Or does it also play a vital part in students' socialization? Or is it logically connected with the concept of education itself?

In the final analysis, problems of order and control are problems of values. On the one hand, there is the view that external constraint is necessary not only for the well-being of society but also for the well-being of the individual. The argument here is that without a framework of imposed order, schools (and society) would disintegrate, and individuals would be unable to pursue their private interests and desires. On the other hand, this view is often regarded as limiting because it denies students their autonomy. The alternative perspective is one which regards the individual as having a propensity to generate his own value system and to create a society which emphasizes the uniqueness of each individual.

According to the first view, the needs of individuals are dependent upon the needs of the school environment; according to the second view, it is individuals who create the school environment and give it meaning. There is thus a clear conflict of values between the "school perspective" and the "individual perspective" which has permeated thinking about the role of school discipline.

Thus, it appears that the aims of a school discipline organization extend from short-range custodial goals to long-range humanistic aims. Each school has to determine its unique situational factors and find the appropriate balance between these two sets of aims.

The climate of a discipline organization includes the extent to which a school is viewed as contributing to the problem, the degree of responsibility school personnel feel for improving the situation, and the extent to which there is an openness to objective problem solving.²³

In a speech at the 1976 National Conference on Citizenship Education, Ewald B. Nyquist, former commissioner of education in the state of New York, made the following comments (as published in Phi Delta Kappan), "Students must learn how to make choices freely and to comprehend and evaluate the consequences of his or her choices. Implicit in the concept of freedom is responsible action, which cannot be equated with license. Individuality does not diminish responsibility or accountability for one's

²³ Willis J. Furtwengler and William Konnert, Improving School Discipline: An Administrator's Guide. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1982), 57.

acts." He also declared that "no student should be turned out of our high schools without ever having come to grips with what it means to be a part of a larger community."²⁴

Tension exists between learning to make one's own choices and learning to be responsible for being part of a community. Historically, the aim of school discipline was the control of the behavior of students through the use of force. In recent decades, this aim, both in the imposition of restraints on individual students and in the use of force as a means of perpetuating the interests of society, has been changed somewhat by the concept of self-direction.²⁵

The tension between the two aims of obedience to external authority and the development of self-control is evident in Willower's work describing the schools' differential emphases on controlling the behavior of students. Willower argues that there will always be a conflict between custodial aims that focus on learning to respond to another's authority and the humanistic aim of learning to direct one's own behavior. Willower concludes that schools aim primarily for pupil control and that preoccupation with this aim can be seen in the organizational and social structures of the school. The two sets of aims appear to exist on a continuum, from humanistic to custodial goals. The custodial approach includes emphasis on the content to be taught,

²⁴ Ewald B. Nyquist, "The American No-Fault Morality," Phi Delta Kappan, 48, (March, 1976): 275.

²⁵ Furtwengler, 38.

teacher direction, rigid classroom procedures, and social disengagement from pupils; the custodial type of school organization places greater emphasis on external order, primitive sanctions and inflexibility in teaching strategies, and views student behavior in stereotyped moralistic terms.²⁶

Willower further suggests that the humanistic approach includes an emphasis on student-directed activities, flexible classroom procedures, and a more permissive attitude toward students. The humanistic school organization stresses self-discipline, democratic processes in the classroom, and flexibility in approach to the curriculum and its objectives; it views students without moralistic overtones.²⁷

Humanism is defined as the desire to put human welfare above all other concerns. Essentially this means that whatever decisions are made and implemented, the projected outcomes must be in the interest of those most likely to be affected. The aim of humanism is to develop students with the desire to act in ways that will not only be personally satisfying but will also be in the interests of others. The outcomes will be behavior that is beneficial to the person and to those with whom the person associates.²⁸

²⁶ Donald J. Willower, Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy, The School and Pupil Control Ideology, Penn State Studies 24, 2d ed. (University Park, Pa.: Penn State University, 1973): 4.

²⁷ Willower, 5.

²⁸ Furtwengler, 41.

Should the aim of school discipline, then, be custodial goals or humanistic goals? Are these two aims mutually exclusive? Research provides some ways to consider this question.

Piaget, Kohlberg, and Glasser, respectively discussing the states of growth, moral development, and appropriate mental health, stress the importance of students' learning to respond to situational factors. These authors argue that students should react to situational factors by assuming personal responsibility.²⁹

Hunt suggests that a student's conceptual level is the key factor to consider in determining the instructional stance toward discipline.³⁰

Hersey and Blanchard provide a framework for determining how much autonomy and structure people may need in different situations. Hersey and Blanchard suggest that the more immature a group is in its abilities to accomplish things as a group, the more structured or custodial the discipline needs to be. They argue that as group members learn to act

²⁹ Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgment of the Child (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932), 65. Lawrence Kohlberg, Education for Justice in Moral Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 57-65. William Glasser, Schools Without Failure, (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 12-24.

³⁰ David E. Hunt, "Conceptual Level Theory and Research as Guides to Educational Practice," Interchange 18, no. 4 (1977-78): 82.

appropriately, their needs for a more humanistic and mature approach to discipline will emerge.³¹

Depending on the situation in the individual school, it may be extremely important to emphasize custodial rather than humanistic control factors. Likewise, in other situations, it is appropriate to stress humanistic rather than custodial factors. Thus, any practical measurement of discipline effectiveness has to be situational since what works in one school does not necessarily work in another.

James Burns, however, argues that to successfully impact discipline, a change in school culture may be necessary. He contends that research has documented that leadership, by changing the culture, can overcome the forces that create a school with poor discipline. Outstanding school administrators often overcome the forces and pressures by virtue of personality, personal commitment or strong philosophy.³²

Burns states that in a school with poor discipline, the following characteristics will be found:

- Teachers either do not provide supervision of halls, restrooms, and public areas of the building or they provide lackluster or "turn-your-back" supervision.

³¹ Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977), 217-223.

³² James A. Burns, "Discipline: Why Does It Continue to Be a Problem: Solution is in Changing School Culture." (NASSP Bulletin, 69, 479 March, 1985), 4.

- The administrative staff is expected by teachers to discipline the students and the administrator has accepted that role.
- There is no common agreement among teachers, or between teachers and the administration, about the enforcement of simple rules about tardiness, dress, etc.
- Consistency in the application of school rules is not enforced by the administration. An individual teacher can decide whether or not to enforce the school rules.
- Neither teachers nor administrators talk to students about expectations of behavior such as respect for adults, patriotic behavior or stealing.
- Teachers don't feel that they will have the support of the principal who does not feel he/she will have the unqualified support of the board and the superintendent when challenged by students or parents. Teachers and principals often feel they will have to be able to prove a case to discipline a student instead of utilizing their own judgment in each case.
- Students who are hard-core discipline problems are not expelled, and teachers and students see gross disrespect and repeated misbehavior that continues to be unresolved.³³

Burns concludes that "schools are also organizations and they are made up of human beings. The human side of organizations cries out for a set of common values and expectations in a school; without such a set of common values, one can be assured that any specific practice, training, or special

33 Burns, 3.

program will have limited or short-term success since the socio-political forces will continue to be the dominant force. "34

Raymond Calabrese makes a similar point about the human side of school organizations when he says that "many schools have difficulty in maintaining proper discipline because educators fail to recognize the importance of human interaction and human relationships. Good school discipline is based on successful communication, which is essentially interaction with other human beings.³⁵

Just as discipline effectiveness is related to the particular school situation and culture at hand, similarly, people's expectations for a desirable administrative style are not constant; they change over time and they vary between school settings. They change as people assess the conditions in a particular situation. "Thus, a principal who is judged to have a high level of effectiveness in one administrative setting may show a low level of effectiveness in a different administrative setting."³⁶

The level of discipline effectiveness in a school is, in part, a function of how discipline and effectiveness are defined. Furtwengler defines discipline as "the roles of principals, teachers, parents and students in establishing and implementing a discipline program, as well as the program itself--the

34 Burns, 5.

35 Raymond L. Calabrese, "Communication is the Key to Good Discipline", NASSP Bulletin, 69, 478, (February 1985), 109.

36 Furtwengler, 7.

processes designed to aid students in developing social behaviors and attitudes for appropriate participation in an adult democratic culture. The personality or climate of a school is related to the development of appropriate student behaviors and is included in this definition of discipline."³⁷

He goes on to state that effectiveness generally implies the achievement of one or more desired expectations. With regard to discipline, such expectations are defined as those aspirations for discipline that a person believes ought to or should occur. Effectiveness, then, is the extent to which it is perceived that expectations are met.³⁸

The concept of discipline effectiveness implies "a concern for the extent to which school-related people and the program in a school are helping the students learn expected social behaviors, attitudes, and personal characteristics."³⁹ Discipline effectiveness is specifically defined as "the extent to which the desired expectations of individuals, groups, and the discipline organization are perceived as being achieved."⁴⁰ When principals, teachers, parents, and students in a school perceive most of these expectations as being successfully accomplished, a relatively high level of discipline effectiveness exists in that school.

³⁷ Furtwengler, 4.

³⁸ Furtwengler, 5-6.

³⁹ Furtwengler, 7.

⁴⁰ Furtwengler, 6.

Furtwengler defines the extent to which a person in a position is perceived as fulfilling others' expectations as position effectiveness. The expectations and perceptions people use to determine someone's position effectiveness relative to discipline are drawn from: the person's individual behavior, the individual outcomes of that behavior, or the person's individual characteristics.

William Reddin concurred that effectiveness is directly related to expected outcomes when he stated that "achieving the expected outcomes of a position should be the only measure of managerial effectiveness."⁴¹

A person's position effectiveness can be assessed by determining the difference between other people's expectations and perceptions regarding the three components of position effectiveness. In general, the larger the gap between the expectations of a group of people and the reality of these components (as perceived by the group), the lower the level of position effectiveness. If a person wants to or is expected to improve position effectiveness, the person can attempt to change the expectations of others, the perceptions of others, or both, but change depends on an accurate assessment of position effectiveness.⁴²

Obtaining measurements, however, can be difficult. An administrator's estimate of his or her own position effectiveness is likely to

⁴¹ William J. Reddin, Managerial Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1970), 3.

⁴² Furtwengler, 23-24.

be quite different from the estimates of those with whom one works. Andrew Halpin's research has led to the conclusion that an administrator's description of his or her own position effectiveness may have little relationship to others' perceptions of the same administrator's position effectiveness.⁴³

Gender and Leadership

A basic organizing concept of our culture is that women are subordinate to men, that leadership historically has been considered a male domain. Prior to 1970, most research on leadership focused on male populations. Friesen has concluded that "the historic identification of leadership with stereotypic masculine personality traits has been an artifact of the overwhelmingly large proportion of men in such positions."⁴⁴ According to Reed, "A woman occupying a leadership role is not only role-incongruent; she is also status-incongruent".⁴⁵ This double incongruity

⁴³ Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, the University of Chicago, 1959), 85.

⁴⁴ L. Friesen, "Women and Leadership" Contemporary Education, 54, (1983), 228.

⁴⁵ B. G. Reed, "Women Leaders in Small Groups: Social-Psychological Perspectives and Strategies" Social Work With Groups, 6, (1983), 37.

has an impact on the emergence of women as leaders in the real world of educational administration as well as in the laboratory research studies reported in the literature on small groups.

There is a body of research evidence either directly indicating or implying that people generally expect the leadership role to be filled by a man. According to Hollander and Yoder, because the leader role is not seen as feminine, "for a women to perform effectively as a leader in today's society, she must redefine either her feminine role or the leadership role".⁴⁶ Either action creates both status and role incongruity.

A particularly interesting study by Porter et al tested two hypotheses: (1) A woman at the head of the table in a mixed-sex group would not be seen as a leader, but a man in that position would. (2) This discrimination would be unrelated to the subjects' personal sex-role attitudes and conscious intentions.⁴⁷

Both hypotheses were clearly confirmed using undergraduate students in introductory psychology classes. The study involved the viewing of slides of five persons seated at a table, with one person at the head and two on either side. Groups were same-sex and mixed-sex with all possible numerical combinations of males, females, and seating arrangements. The position at the head of the table is a status cue to leadership, the expected effect of which

⁴⁶ E. P. Hollander & J. Yoder, "Some Issues in Comparing Women and Men as Leaders" Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1, (1980), 271.

⁴⁷ N. Porter, F. L. Geis, and Jennings J., "Are Women Invisible as Leaders?" Sex Roles, 9, (1983), 1037.

was eliminated by sex-role stereotypes in all but the all-female groups, when subjects were asked to identify the "person who would contribute the most to the group," i.e., the leader.

Interestingly, when a woman at the head of the table was seen as a leader in the all-female group, she was also seen as "cold", a correlation not found for male leaders. This finding is consistent with studies which indicate that women who do succeed in all-male domains tend to have, or are perceived to have, unattractive personality characteristics.

The researchers concluded that the discrimination evidenced in this study, that in a mixed-group a woman will be viewed as a nonleader when situational cues suggest a leadership position for her, is the kind of discrimination which has impeded women's rise to leadership positions. If discrimination operated nonconsciously, and even in spite of individuals' conscious intentions not to discriminate, then a self-fulfilling prophecy is set up which has "serious consequences for stereotyping of women, in general, and women's self-confidence, in particular".⁴⁸ Self-confidence is affected when male decision-makers tend to conclude that their "failure to recognize women as leaders represents women's failure to act like leaders".⁴⁹ It is difficult to realize that one may be discriminating when one is sincerely attempting not to discriminate. In fact, conclude Porter et al, it is possible that "the discrimination occurs precisely because of people's sincerity in

⁴⁸ Porter, 1046.

⁴⁹ Porter, 1046.

consciously rejecting sexual prejudice. It is virtually impossible to doubt one's own sincere perceptions".⁵⁰

D. T. Campbell supports this belief. He writes, "The ordinary man is totally unaware that his drives, values, and learnings influence his perception, that his articulation of sense data into meaningful perceptions is dependent upon past experience and memory".⁵¹ The leadership and sex role stereotypes predominant in the culture are influences on perception which require an enormous effort to neutralize.

Stereotypes form early in a person's life. In terms of leadership emergence, the stereotype-and-bias system can be self-perpetuating for both men and women. According to Porter et al., "Women who find themselves passed over for leadership posts must conclude that their lack of recognition indicates lack of merit. (And men, who receive the recognition, similarly learn to attribute their successes to their own ability)".⁵²

Research indicates that women possess as much administrative potential and capability as men do. However, there is a notably disproportionate number of women in positions of educational leadership. If this situation is to change, educational systems as well as individual thinking patterns must be examined.

⁵⁰ Porter, 1046.

⁵¹ D. T. Campbell, "Stereotypes and Perception of Group Differences", American Psychologist, 22, (1967), 819.

⁵² Porter, 1046.

Indeed, DeLyon and Migniuolo state that "women teachers' expectations and perceptions about themselves and their roles are shaped not only by the schools where they work but also by their own experiences as girls, in and outside school, and the female role models presented to them. Society's expectations about women and the careers they should pursue also influence women teachers' perceptions of themselves and their treatment by male colleagues. But the most direct influence on women students' expectations of themselves as women teachers is the formal education they experience in preparing for a career as a teacher."⁵³

Suzanne Taylor argues that the most blatant barrier for the upward mobility of women educators is prejudice. She claims that those who hire and promote school administrators simply preferred men to women. She labels this concept "role prejudice" which "develops when there are genetic differences in the human population which are visible, but not significant for role performance. The political implication is that such role prejudice translates into discrimination against individuals who strive to achieve outside of their socially defined role shared by women and men alike, that accounts for the political reality of few top spots for women."⁵⁴

⁵³ Hilary DeLyon and Frances Widdowson Migniuolo. Women Teachers: Issues and Experiences. Philadelphia: Open University Press, (1989), 3.

⁵⁴ Suzanne S. Taylor, "The Attitudes of Superintendents and Boards of Education Members in Connecticut Toward the Employment and Effectiveness of Women Public School Administrators" (Doctoral diss., University of Connecticut, 1971). 23.

Haven's findings support the concept of role prejudice. Her studies found that the qualities associated with top-level administrative leadership: intellectual achievement, competence, independence and competition, are also associated with masculinity and are thus inconsistent with the popular concept of femininity.⁵⁵

Role prejudice is again at work when Freedman contends that certain leadership qualities such as emotional stability, self-reliance, and aggressiveness, that are approved of in men, are sometimes found overbearing in women.⁵⁶

A woman aspiring to leadership can expect to experience negative responses. Reed notes that both men and women are "likely to discount a women's leadership abilities and credentials"⁵⁷ in order to maintain assumptions about women having lower status. A woman seeking an administrative position needs to demonstrate to those with whom she will work and to those making hiring decisions that she is task-oriented and competent. She needs to communicate in a nonthreatening manner that she has both intelligence and expertise. Some women do this by earning doctoral

⁵⁵ Elizabeth W. Haven, Women in Educational Administration: The Principalship. A Literature Review. (Report No. EA 013 964). Annandale, VA: JWK International Corp. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208486). 1980.

⁵⁶ Ira Freedman, "Women in Educational Administration." The Education Digest, (March 1980)

⁵⁷ Reed, 38.

degrees, for the highly credentialed woman is often rated as more competent than a man with similar credentials.⁵⁸

In her writing on this subject, Shakeshaft reports the opinions of practicing administrators: "In trying to command or maintain authority, women must take into account not only the people with whom they work but also how those people view women. Many women note that ways of establishing authority that work for men do not necessarily work for them. Contrary to the notion that being like a man will automatically signify authority, many women voice concern over the effectiveness of such strategies. Some women report that they try to look less authoritarian, less in charge, and less threatening in an effort to be effective . . . Through language and appearance, they make themselves more tentative and less threatening. These strategies appear to work."⁵⁹

In the minds of many, effective leadership is still associated with stereotypically masculine behaviors, in spite of evidence that the most effective leaders combine task-oriented and interpersonally-oriented behaviors.

It is encouraging to note that women writers in 1980 identified similar leadership skills for administrators as did male writers in 1984. Both spoke of

⁵⁸ Reed, 39.

⁵⁹ C. Shakeshaft, "Theory in a Changing Reality." Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7, (1987), 14.

the need for trust, sharing, vulnerability, communication, openness, and the enjoyment of life.⁶⁰

Linda Grace, Robert Buser, and Dean Stuck, in the November, 1987 issue of the NASSP Bulletin, describe several characteristics of outstanding administrators. These characteristics include:

- **Conscientiousness:** Outstanding administrators want to give their best; they are unwilling to maintain the status quo, and they are always seeking ways to make a school a better place to learn and to work. They demand excellence of themselves and their staff members and usually get it.
- **Enthusiasm:** Outstanding administrators are "doers and movers" with high energy levels. They set realistic goals for themselves and the schools and pursue them in an organized and enthusiastic manner. They maintain a high level of visibility within their school
- **Sensitivity:** Outstanding administrators are good listeners. They tend to be caring and committed; they pay attention to and frequently implement staffs' suggestions. They are willing to serve others when needed and receive good service from staff members in return.
- **Knowledge:** Outstanding administrators are perceived to be knowledgeable by staff members and by students and parents.
- **Objectivity:** Outstanding administrators are deemed to be fair, objective persons who don't play favorites with staff, students, or community

⁶⁰ Angela C. Fryer, "A Checklist for the Successful Administrator." "NASSP Bulletin", (December 1980).

members. They ensure that everyone understands the school's rules and then enforce the rules firmly and consistently for all.

- Communication: Outstanding administrators keep the lines of communication open with all constituencies. They possess good oral and written communication skills and encourage staff, students, and the community to share their concerns and suggestions for improving the school's effectiveness.⁶¹

Grace, Buser, and Stuck also outline some of the activities that work to reduce administrators' effectiveness. These include:

- becoming desk or office bound
- relying too heavily on "the way we've always done things"
- being too easily swayed or influenced by constituent groups
- accepting too many responsibilities and delegating too few
- using time inefficiently or ineffectively
- overreacting to trivial incidents
- assuming the role of troubleshooter rather than being goal and achievement-oriented
- failing to gain the respect and support of the staff
- failing to listen to concerns and suggestions of constituents

⁶¹ Linda Grace and Robert Buser, and Dean Stuck, "What Works and What Doesn't: Characteristics of Outstanding Administrators", NASSP Bulletin, (November 1987), 74.

- insisting on autocratic decision-making procedures⁶²

Overall, outstanding administrators have the ability:

- to relate to all kinds of people
- to build a sense of cohesiveness and a feeling of family among staff and students
- to create a climate in which people can work productively and learn effectively⁶³

For a woman to be perceived as a leader requires "acting like a leader" without seeming to be threatening or submissive to men, either verbally or nonverbally. Acting like a leader means being verbally active in group situations and displaying knowledge and skill. Even men who consciously attempt nondiscriminatory behavior may not be able to see a woman as a leader because perceptions of women as leaders are influenced at an unconscious level by sex-role stereotypes.⁶⁴

Despite role prejudice, the greatest indication of future success for women in educational leadership is provided by an exploration of women's leadership styles and the use of networking in administrative structures.

⁶² Grace, 75-76.

⁶³ Grace, 76.

⁶⁴ Linda Lyman Gale, "Gender and Leadership: The Implications of Small Group Research", Initiatives, 51, 4, (1988), 20.

Because women identify themselves with an ethic of care and compassion, it is important that leadership skills in women be sought and exercised in the language and experience of human relationships.

Gilligan reports that women are more tolerant of rules, more willing to make exceptions, more willing to accept innovation, and less competitive. She observes their overriding concerns to be with relationships, and reports that they judge themselves in terms of their ability to care.⁶⁵

Gilligan goes on to argue that women view aggression as the outcome of the hierarchical construction of human relationships and that because they put relationships ahead of rules, they tend to have a more contextual mode of making judgments. She reports that women tend to focus on the resolution of the real as opposed to hypothetical dilemmas. She is perhaps most all-encompassing (convincing) in her description of women's ways of looking at the world when she writes that they "give rise to the ethics of justice and care, the ideals of human relationship--the vision that self and others will be treated as of equal worth, that despite differences in power, things will be fair; the vision that everyone will be responded to and included, that no one will be left alone or hurt. These disparate visions in their tension reflect the paradoxical truths of human experience--that we know ourselves as separate only insofar as we live in connection with others, and that we experience relationship only insofar as we differentiate other from self."⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Carol Gilligan, In a Different Voice, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, (1982.)

⁶⁶ Gilligan, 62.

Gilligan summarizes her position by saying that "...the moral judgments of women differ from those of men in the greater extent to which women's judgments are tied to feelings of empathy and compassion."⁶⁷ Men have developed their definition of successful judgment in a context of effectiveness and distance, whereas women's views are created in an environment of intimacy.

Closely related to the process of education for participation in a democratic community is women's conflict between rights and responsibility. Women encounter the conflict between making judgments on the basis of rights which are inherent in an adversarial situation on the one hand and the need to be supportive and nurturing of all people on the other hand.

Gilligan contends that women recognize that decisions are ethical only when special circumstances are taken into account, that is when the distance is eradicated in favor of intimacy. Gilligan takes her discussion of the differences in men's and women's ways of thinking to the point of demonstrating that women are more concerned about both sides of a relationship and thus are much more likely to recognize interdependence in general and certainly more likely to perceive that they themselves are interdependent.

Gilligan writes that "By positing two different modes of leadership for men and women--the first based on rights, respect, and individuation, and

⁶⁷ Gilligan, 69.

the second on responsibility, care, and relationship--we may arrive at a deeper understanding of human experience and leadership."⁶⁸

No one leadership style is universally suitable for all situations. Women today can show us a vision that refashions self-concept and challenges administrators to again foster human potential in all persons. Women's priority on human relationships, care, responsibility, equity, fairness, inclusion, intimacy, interdependence and cooperation are the very essence of a democratic community. That women as discipline deans in secondary schools hold these values and construct their roles on the foundation they make, may promise a learning structure and content that is far different from the traditional males school organization.

⁶⁸ Gilligan, 163.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter III begins with an explanation of the design of the study and a discussion of the subjects used. This is followed by a description of the survey instrument used and a detailed explanation of the administration of the survey. Finally, the data is analyzed and summarized.

Design of the Study

This dissertation studied whether gender plays a role in discipline effectiveness in the secondary schools. This was accomplished through the use of a survey instrument administered to selected teachers in five public DuPage County and Cook County secondary schools. The survey measured teachers' expectations for a person in the dean's position as well as their perceptions of their own school's male and female deans. Through the measures of expectations and perceptions, the researcher derived a correlation of effectiveness for both the male and female deans.

Sample Selections

Five public secondary schools in the west suburban Chicago area were selected for this study. Two of the schools are in DuPage County and three are in suburban Cook County. Each of the selected schools serves 9th to 12th grades and has a medium to large student population; the number of students ranges from 2,200 to 3,100 students per school. The size of the faculty ranges from 137 to 226 certified staff members.. Each school employs at least one male and at least one female dean whose primary responsibility is student discipline.

School A is in western suburban DuPage County in a suburb with a population of 39,500. The school has a student population of 2,200 and 140 faculty members; its student minority population is 21%

School B is also in DuPage County in a suburb with 48,500 inhabitants. The school has 3,100 students with a minority population of 15% and 226 faculty members.

School C is in suburban Cook County in a suburb of 7,600. It serves 2,250 students (82% minority) and has 148 faculty members.

School D, also in suburban Cook County, has a student population of 2,100 and 137 faculty members. The student minority population is 95%; the school is located in a village of 27,000.

School E is in a town of 67,000 in suburban Cook County. Its 3,100 students are served by 200 faculty members. The student minority population is 70%.

The sample for this study consisted of 50 teachers from each of the five above-described DuPage and suburban Cook County high schools. These teachers were selected by the building principal without regard to age, race, level of education, or teaching experience. The only proviso given the principals with regard to distributing the surveys was that 25 female teachers and 25 male teachers in each building be given the opportunity to respond.

Of the 250 teachers from the five schools who received the surveys, the total number of respondents who completed the survey was 86, for a return rate of 34%. The rate of return was disappointing; perhaps an explanation lies in the fact that the survey had a total of 150 questions. The breakdown by school is as follows:

SURVEY RETURN RATE (BY SCHOOL)

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Return Rate</u>
School A	17 of 50	34%
School B	21 of 50	42%
School C	16 of 50	32%
School D	18 of 50	36%
School E	14 of 50	28%

Table 1

Each respondent completed a Personal Data sheet (Appendix A) at the beginning of the survey instrument which asked for demographic information: 1) years as a teacher, 2) years as a teacher in current district, 3) gender, 4) age, 5) ethnic background, and 6) highest educational level attained. (Tables 2 - 7) This information was collected to determine whether any of the six above-mentioned characteristics affected the respondent's answers.

PERSONAL DATA

Total Sample N = 86

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	12	14%	1 to 5	19	22%
6 to 10	10	11%	6 to 10	21	24%
11 to 15	12	14%	11 to 15	8	9%
16 to 20	15	17%	16 to 20	8	9%
21 to 25	21	24%	21 to 25	19	22%
25+	17	20%	25+	11	13%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	42	48%	29 or less	12	14%
Female	45	52%	30 to 39	14	16%
			40 to 49	37	43%
			50 to 59	22	25%
			60 or more	2	2%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	79	91%	Bachelor's	14	16%
Black	3	3%	Master's	67	77%
Hispanic	1	1%	Doctorate	2	2%
Other	3	3%	Other	3	3%

Table 2

PERSONAL DATA

School A N = 17

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	3	18%	1 to 5	7	41%
6 to 10	3	18%	6 to 10	4	23%
11 to 15	6	35%	11 to 15	1	6%
16 to 20	3	18%	16 to 20	3	18%
21 to 25	1	6%	21 to 25	1	6%
25+	1	6%	25+	1	6%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	10	59%	29 or less	3	18%
Female	7	41%	30 to 39	5	29%
			40 to 49	6	35%
			50 to 59	3	18%
			60 or more	0	0%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	17	100%	Bachelor's	4	24%
Black	0	0%	Master's	12	71%
Hispanic	0	0%	Doctorate	0	0%
Other	0	0%	Other	0	0%

Table 3

PERSONAL DATA

School B N = 21

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	1	5%	1 to 5	2	10%
6 to 10	1	5%	6 to 10	5	24%
11 to 15	0	0%	11 to 15	4	19%
16 to 20	7	33%	16 to 20	2	10%
21 to 25	6	29%	21 to 25	5	24%
25+	6	29%	25+	3	14%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	9	43%	29 or less	1	5%
Female	12	57%	30 to 39	1	5%
			40 to 49	11	52%
			50 to 59	7	33%
			60 or more	1	5%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	20	95%	Bachelor's	1	5%
Black	0	0%	Master's	19	90%
Hispanic	0	0%	Doctorate	1	5%
Other	1	5%	Other	0	0%

Table 4

PERSONAL DATA

School C N = 16

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	1	6%	1 to 5	2	13%
6 to 10	3	19%	6 to 10	5	31%
11 to 15	2	13%	11 to 15	1	6%
16 to 20	1	6%	16 to 20	1	6%
21 to 25	5	31%	21 to 25	5	31%
25+	4	25%	25+	2	13%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	7	44%	29 or less	3	19%
Female	9	56%	30 to 39	4	25%
			40 to 49	6	37%
			50 to 59	3	19%
			60 or more	0	0%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	12	75%	Bachelor's	3	19%
Black	2	12%	Master's	10	63%
Hispanic	1	6%	Doctorate	1	6%
Other	1	6%	Other	2	12%

Table 5

PERSONAL DATA

School D N = 19

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	1	5%	1 to 5	1	5%
6 to 10	2	10%	6 to 10	6	32%
11 to 15	3	16%	11 to 15	2	10%
16 to 20	3	16%	16 to 20	1	5%
21 to 25	7	37%	21 to 25	7	37%
25+	3	16%	25+	2	11%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	10	53%	29 or less	1	5%
Female	9	47%	30 to 39	3	16%
			40 to 49	8	42%
			50 to 59	6	32%
			60 or more	1	5%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	16	84%	Bachelor's	2	10%
Black	2	11%	Master's	17	90%
Hispanic	0	0%	Doctorate	0	0%
Other	1	5%	Other	0	0%

Table 6

PERSONAL DATA

School E N = 14

Years as a Teacher			Years as a Teacher (this District)		
Years	Number	Percent	Years	Number	Percent
1 to 5	6	43%	1 to 5	7	50%
6 to 10	1	7%	6 to 10	1	7%
11 to 15	1	7%	11 to 15	0	0%
16 to 20	1	7%	16 to 20	1	7%
21 to 25	2	14%	21 to 25	2	14%
25+	3	22%	25+	3	22%

Gender			Age		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Male	6	43%	29 or less	4	29%
Female	8	57%	30 to 39	1	7%
			40 to 49	6	43%
			50 to 59	3	21%
			60 or more	0	0%

Ethnic Background			Highest Educational Level		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Caucasian	14	100%	Bachelor's	4	29%
Black	0	0%	Master's	9	64%
Hispanic	0	0%	Doctorate	0	0%
Other	0	0%	Other	1	7%

Table 7

Subjects

The subjects of the survey in each building were a male dean and a female dean whose primary responsibility was student discipline. The survey identified by name the male and female dean to consider when completing the instrument. This was necessary since, in some buildings, more than one male or one female dean existed. The specific deans considered in each building were selected by the researcher with the purpose of matching as closely as possible both deans' length of time in the position.

LENGTH OF TIME IN DEAN'S POSITION

	<u>Male Dean</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>
School A	5 years	2 years
School B	9 years	9 years
School C	4 years	4 years
School D	4 years	4 years
School E	10 years	9 years

Table 8

Instrument

The researcher wrote seeking permission (Appendix B) and obtained permission (Appendix C) to use the survey instrument, Basic Leadership Inventory, constructed by the Research and Service Institute, Inc. of Wichita, Kansas. The survey has been normed and validated and consists of two parts.

Part I consists of 50 Likert-type statements designed to assess teachers' expectations for the dean's position with regard to discipline. (Appendix D) Part II consists of 50 Likert-type statements designed to identify teachers' perceptions of the individual holding the position with regard to discipline. (Appendix E)

Survey respondents answered Part I (Expectations) once. They then answered Part II (Perceptions) twice--once with regard to the female dean and a second time with regard to the male dean. The responses to the expectations form and the perceptions forms were compared to determine effectiveness. The effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean. The survey measures leadership skills in six clustered areas:

- Task/Initiating Structure: the extent to which the administrator recognizes and defines reality, identifies and solves problems, sets reasonable goals, takes actions, and focuses attention on the organization.

- Caring Personal Characteristics: the extent to which the administrator is viewed as: 1) being warm and caring, sensitive, open, and 2) having a sense of values and trust of others.
- Relationships: the extent to which the administrator: 1) listens to others, 2) recognizes the work of others, 3) shares decision-making with others, 4) is firm and consistent, and 5) is willing to examine his/her own actions. It also is the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of: 1) trust and respect for individual integrity, 2) warmth and caring among individuals, and 3) fairness and empowerment.
- Cultural Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains others' commitments to the aims, goals, and mission of the organization. It also is the extent to which the administrator helps others develop a sense of community and maintain a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.
- Personal Challenge: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment for helping others develop personal and professional aims that lead to a sense of independence, responsibility, and selflessness.
- Quality Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of self-improvement, organizational improvement, and commitment to learning.

Administration of the Survey

A letter (Appendix F) and a survey were sent to fifteen DuPage County and suburban Cook County principals who employed at least one male and one female dean. Follow-up telephone calls were made to these fifteen principals to ascertain whether they were willing to permit their faculty's participation in the study; five principals agreed to participate.

A letter to each principal (Appendix G), a cover letter to the participating teachers (Appendix H), and 50 copies of the survey were then sent to each building principal with specific instructions to choose 25 female faculty members and 25 male faculty members to complete the survey. The survey identified by name the male and female dean to consider when completing the instrument. This was necessary since, in some buildings, more than one male or one female dean existed. The specific deans considered in each building were selected with the purpose of matching as closely as possible both deans' length of time in the position.

The teachers had two weeks in which to complete and return the surveys to the principals' offices; each principal then mailed the surveys to the researcher. A letter was sent to each principal to thank them for allowing their staff to participate in the research. (Appendix I)

Analysis of the Data

When the completed surveys were returned, the data were entered so that the responses A - E corresponded to the numbers 1 - 5, respectively. Each form of the survey included the same 15 positive items and 35 negative items, for a total of 50 items. For example, items such as "cheerful, optimistic", in which 1 represented the best possible rating, were positive items. On the other hand, items such as "impersonal, distant", in which 1 represented the worst score, were negative items. The positive items included items #'s 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 27, 29, 34. The negative items included items #'s 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36 and 37-50.

To interpret the data, all of the items were consistent (i.e. with the rating scale in the same direction), requiring either the negative or the positive items to be recoded. For ease of analysis, the positive items were recoded on SPSS so that a "5" would always represent the highest score, and a "1" the lowest.

The first step of the analysis of the data involved deriving a measure of discipline effectiveness for the female and male dean of each participating school on six dimensions: Task/Initiating Structure, Caring Personal Characteristics, Relationships, Cultural Leadership, Personal Challenge, and Quality Leadership. This effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean, on each dimension. Then the mean discipline

effectiveness score was obtained for each school as well as for the total sample. For example, to arrive at the female dean's effectiveness in the Task/Initiating dimension in School A, the Task/Initiating ratings given to the female dean in School A were subtracted from the Task/Initiating ratings based on dean expectations for School A, per respondent.

After six mean measures of effectiveness were obtained for each dean, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance was used to compare males and females on each of the six dimensions. The Repeated Measures ANOVA measures the within group change (i.e. how group of respondents changed from the male rating to the female rating) in order to see if the respondent rated the two deans significantly different. This analysis was performed for each school, as well as for the total sample.

Summary

This dissertation studied whether gender plays a role in discipline effectiveness in the secondary schools. This was accomplished through the use of a survey instrument administered to selected teachers in five public, DuPage County and Cook County secondary schools. The survey measured teachers' expectations for a person in the dean's position as well as their perceptions of their own school's male and female deans. Through the measures of expectations and perceptions, the researcher derived a correlation of effectiveness for both the male and female deans.

Chapter IV is an analysis of the data collected through the use of the survey instrument. Chapter V is a discussion and summary of the problem, the purpose, the hypotheses, the research instrument, an analysis of the data, findings of the study, implications for practice, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapter IV includes an analysis of the data and an evaluation of Hypotheses I, II, III, IV, V, and VI. It concludes with a summary of the data.

Analysis of the Data

Teachers in five selected public DuPage County and suburban Cook County secondary schools answered Part I of the Basic Leadership Profile, which measured expectations, once. They then answered Part II, which measured perceptions, twice--once with regard to the female dean and a second time with regard to the male dean. The responses to the expectations form and the perceptions forms were compared to determine effectiveness.

The first step of the analysis of the data involved deriving a measure of discipline effectiveness for the female and male dean of each participating school on six dimensions: Task/Initiating Structure, Caring Personal Characteristics, Relationships, Cultural Leadership, Personal Challenge, and Quality Leadership. This effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean, on each dimension. Then the mean discipline effectiveness score was obtained for each school as well as for the total sample.

After six mean measures of effectiveness were obtained for each dean, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance was used to compare males and females on each of the six dimensions. The Repeated Measures ANOVA measures the within group change (i.e. how group of respondents changed from the male rating to the female rating) in order to see if the respondent rated the two deans significantly different. This analysis was performed for each school, as well as for the total sample.

Hypothesis I

Null hypothesis I states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to Task/Initiating structure, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis I was addressed by responses to survey questions 2, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, and 23. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample (86 responses) follow. At the end of each table is the mean score and standard deviation for the entire cluster group, in this case Task/Initiating Structure. Table 9 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 10 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 11 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 12 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. The Table 13 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 14 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as be male and female respondents.

<p style="text-align: center;">EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS Task/Initiating Structure N = 86</p>

2.	M: 4.61	SD: .67	Persistent
7.	M: 4.70	SD: .85	Well-informed
9.	M: 4.11	SD: .92	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 4.77	SD: .47	Decisive
14.	M: 4.80	SD: .45	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 4.49	SD: .96	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.83	SD: .53	Follow through
21.	M: 4.82	SD: .45	Persevere
23.	M: 3.82	SD: .86	Do his/her own thinking
TOTAL	M: 4.53	SD: .26	

Table 9

The mean score for Expectations of Task/Initiating Structure was 4.53; the highest score possible was 5.00. The mean scores for the individual questions ranged from a low of 3.82 to a high of 4.83.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS			
Task/Initiating Structure N = 86			

2.	M: 4.25	SD: .70	Persistent
7.	M: 4.18	SD: .99	Well-informed
9.	M: 3.92	SD: 1.03	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 4.29	SD: .87	Decisive
14.	M: 4.29	SD: .85	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 3.99	SD: 1.09	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.24	SD: .94	Follow through
21.	M: 4.34	SD: .74	Persevere
23.	M: 3.90	SD: .90	Do his/her own thinking
TOTAL	M: 4.05	SD: .48	

Table 10

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the cluster mean score was 4.05. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.90 to 4.29.

In the teachers' perception, the female deans scored lower than expectation on every question with the exception of one. The teachers' expectation for question #23, Do his/her own thinking, had a mean score of 3.82; they gave the female deans a mean score of 3.90. This, however, is not statistically significant.

<p style="text-align: center;">PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS Task/Initiating Structure N = 86</p>

2.	M: 3.95	SD: 1.15	Persistent
7.	M: 4.01	SD: 1.10	Well-informed
9.	M: 3.62	SD: 1.11	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 3.97	SD: 1.13	Decisive
14.	M: 4.13	SD: 1.00	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 3.90	SD: 1.00	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.13	SD: .96	Follow through
21.	M: 4.20	SD: .96	Persevere
23.	M: 3.69	SD: .97	Do his/her own thinking
TOTAL	M: 3.83	SD: .69	

Table 11

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for the Task/Initiating Structure cluster was 3.83. This was considerably lower than the Expectation score, which was 4.53. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.62 to 4.20.

In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored lower than expectation on every question. In the teachers' perception, the male deans also scored lower than the female dean on every question. That is, the male deans were considered to be: less persistent, less well-informed, less aroused by challenge, less decisive, less able to identify/solve problems, less able to plan ahead, less able to follow through, less able to persevere, and less able to do his/her own thinking than the female deans.

<p style="text-align: center;">COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS Total Sample N = 86</p>

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
I. Task/Initiating Structure	4.53	.26	4.05	.48	3.83	.69

Table 12

In summary, with regard to Task/Initiating Structure, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.53. The teachers perceived the female deans as closer to expectation than the male deans; the female deans had a perceptions score of 4.05, and the male deans had a perceptions score of 3.83.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By School Task/Initiating Structure</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	86	3.52 **	5.36
School A	17	4.47	5.58
School B	21	.57	1.33
School C	16	4.37	6.37
School D	18	6.00	11.83
School E	14	2.64	1.64

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 13

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Task/Initiating Structure and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 3.52, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 5.36. Thus, the female dean was considered significantly more effective than the male dean with regard to Task/Initiating Structure.

At four of the five selected schools, the female deans were considered more effective in terms of Task/Initiating Structure than the male dean.

At School A, the female dean had an effectiveness score of 4.47 as compared to the male dean's score of 5.58. The female dean was slightly more effective than the male dean.

At School B, the female dean had an effectiveness score of .57 as compared the male dean's score of 1.33. These scores are notable for they indicate that both deans, although the female dean slightly more so, are considered very close to expectation with regard to Task/Initiating Structure. The deans at this school are considerably more effective than the deans at the other four schools, in terms of Task/Initiating Structure.

At School C, the female dean had an effectiveness score of 4.37, and the male dean had a score of 6.37. Again, the female dean is closer to expectation, i.e. more effective, than the male dean with regard to Task/Initiating Structure.

At School D, the scores are also notable, however, they are notable by how far they are from expectation. The female dean had an effectiveness score of 6.00 while the male dean had a score of 11.83. Again, the female dean was more effective than the male dean, but both deans were far below expectation.

At School E, the female dean had an effectiveness score of 2.64 and the male dean, 1.64. This was the only school where the male dean was closer to expectation than the female dean. Both the male and female deans' scores were quite close to expectation, however. Only the deans at School B had better effectiveness scores.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Female and Male Respondents Task/Initiating Structure</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Total Sample	86	3.52 **	5.36
Female Respondents	45	2.35	5.64
Male Respondents	41	4.80	5.05
School A	17	4.47	5.58
Female Respondents	7	2.00	5.14
Male Respondents	10	6.20	5.90
School B	21	.57	1.33
Female Respondents	12	-.58	1.17
Male Respondents	9	2.11	1.56
School C	16	4.37	6.37
Female Respondents	9	2.00	5.79
Male Respondents	7	7.43	7.14
School D	18	6.00	11.83
Female Respondents	9	5.67	15.22**
Male Respondents	9	6.33	8.44
School E	14	2.64	1.64
Female Respondents	8	3.75	1.87
Male Respondents	6	1.17	1.33

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 14

Table 14 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, the female deans were rated considerably more effective than the male deans by female teachers. There was no difference in the way the female and male teachers rated the male dean; both rated them less effective than the female deans.

At School A, female respondents rated the female dean considerably more effective than did the male respondents. There was no difference in the way female or male teachers rated the male dean.

At School B, the female teachers gave the female dean a mean effectiveness score of -.58 which means that she was perceived more favorably than expectation. The male teachers rated the female dean as slightly less effective than the male dean.

At School C, the female teachers rated both the female dean and the male dean as more effective than the male teachers rated them.

At School D, neither dean was rated very effective, although the female teachers rated the male dean as significantly less effective than either the female dean or expectation.

At School E, the female teachers rated the male dean more effective than the female dean. The male teachers rated the male dean slightly less effective than the female dean.

In summary, null hypothesis I states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to Task/Initiating structure, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is rejected; the data showed a significant (.05) difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to Task/Initiating structure. The data showed that female deans were significantly more effective than male deans in being persistent, well-informed, aroused by challenge, decisive, able to identify/solve problems, and in planning ahead, following through, persevering, and doing his/her own thinking.

Hypothesis II

Null hypothesis II states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to caring personal characteristics, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis II was addressed by responses to survey questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 12. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample follow. Table 15 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 16 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 17 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 18 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. Table 19 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 20 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as be male and female respondents.

EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS Caring Personal Characteristics N = 86			
1.	M: 4.09	SD: .82	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.95	SD: 1.02	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.57	SD: .99	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 4.62	SD: .67	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 4.63	SD: .53	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.08	SD: 1.01	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 4.17	SD: .85	Accepting of others
11.	M: 4.44	SD: .84	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.53	SD: .98	Trusting of others
TOTAL	M: 4.17	SD: .68	

Table 15

The mean score for Expectations of Caring Personal Characteristics was 4.17; the highest score possible was a 5.00. The mean scores for the individual questions ranged from a low of 3.08 to a high of 4.63.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS			
Caring Personal Characteristics N = 86			

1.	M: 3.77	SD: .97	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.44	SD: 1.15	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.14	SD: 1.14	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 3.98	SD: 1.01	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 3.94	SD: .88	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.06	SD: .99	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 3.59	SD: 1.05	Accepting of others
11.	M: 3.87	SD: 1.11	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.21	SD: .92	Trusting of others
TOTAL	M: 3.79	SD: .68	

Table 16

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the cluster mean score for Caring Personal Characteristics was 3.79, which was lower than the Expectation score of 4.17. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.06 to 3.98.

In the teachers' perception, the female deans scored lower than expectation on every question, although the expectation score for Patient/Lenient was 3.08 while the perception of female deans score for Patient/Lenient was 3.06. Statistically, there is no difference between these two scores.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS			
Caring Personal Characteristics N = 86			

1.	M: 3.86	SD: 1.05	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.60	SD: 1.03	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.56	SD: 1.10	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 4.17	SD: .94	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 3.98	SD: .92	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.33	SD: 1.10	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.02	Accepting of others
11.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.05	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.31	SD: .93	Trusting of others
TOTAL	M: 3.74	SD: .68	

Table 17

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for the Caring Personal Characteristics cluster was 3.74. This was slightly lower than the Expectations score, which was 4.17, but virtually the same as the Perception score for the female deans, 3.79. The male deans scored slightly higher than or the same as the female deans on all individual questions. Thus, the male deans were considered slightly more: cheerful/optimistic, warm/caring, relaxed/not combative, calm/composed, sensitive to the needs of others, patient/lenient, accepting of others, and trusting of others than the female deans.

COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

Total Sample N = 86

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
II. Caring Personal Characteristics	4.17	.68	3.79	.68	3.74	.68

Table 18

In summary, with regard to Caring Personal Characteristics, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.17. The teachers perceived both the female deans and the male deans as slightly below expectations. The perceptions of the female deans and the male deans were virtually equal.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By School Caring Personal Characteristics</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	83	3.93	2.42
School A	16	6.12	3.75
School B	19	1.58	1.10
School C	16	3.44	3.87
School D	18	4.61	1.50
School E	14	4.29	2.21

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 19

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Caring Personal Characteristics and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 3.93, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 2.42. There was very little difference in effectiveness between the female deans and the male deans.

At four of the five selected schools, the male dean was considered more effective in terms of Caring Personal Relationships than the female dean.

At School A, the female dean had an effectiveness score of 6.12 as compared to the male dean's score of 3.75. The male dean was more effective than the female dean.

At School B, there was virtually no difference between effectiveness of the male and female deans. The female dean had an effectiveness score of 1.58 and the male dean had a score of 1.10. Again, School B's scores are noteworthy for being very close to expectations.

At School C, there was virtually no difference between effectiveness of the male and female deans. The female dean had an effectiveness score of 3.44 and the male dean had a score of 3.87.

At School D, the male dean was quite close to expectation; his effectiveness score was 1.50. He was more effective than the female dean whose effectiveness score was 4.61.

At School E, the male dean was considered slightly more effective with a score of 2.21 compared to the female dean's score of 4.29.

<p align="center">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Female and Male Respondents Caring Personal Characteristics</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Total Sample	83	3.93	2.42
Female Respondents	44	3.95	2.07
Male Respondents	39	3.90	2.82
School A	16	6.12	3.75
Female Respondents	7	5.57	4.00
Male Respondents	9	6.56	3.56
School B	19	1.58	1.10
Female Respondents	11	.81	.91
Male Respondents	8	2.62	1.37
School C	16	3.44	3.87
Female Respondents	9	3.33	3.22
Male Respondents	7	3.57	4.71
School D	18	4.61	1.50
Female Respondents	9	4.56	2.00
Male Respondents	9	4.67	1.00
School E	14	4.29	2.21
Female Respondents	8	6.87	.75
Male Respondents	6	.83	4.17

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 20

Table 20 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, the female deans were rated as less effective than the male deans by both female and male teachers.

At School A, the female dean was rated as less effective than the male dean by both female and male teachers.

At School B, the female teachers rated both the female and male deans as both close to expectation and virtually equally effective. The male teachers rated the male dean as slightly more effective than the female dean.

At School C, the female teachers rated both the female and male deans as virtually equally effective. The male teachers rated the female dean as slightly more effective than the male dean.

At School D, both female and male teachers rated the male dean as more effective than the female dean.

At School E, female teachers rated the female dean as quite ineffective (the lowest effectiveness score in the total sample, 6.87); the female teachers rated the male dean as quite effective (the highest effectiveness score in the total sample, .75). The male teachers, on the other hand, rated the female dean as much more effective than the male dean.

In summary, null hypothesis II states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to caring personal characteristics, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is rejected; the data showed a significant (.05) difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to caring personal characteristics. The data showed that the male deans were significantly more effective than the female deans in being cheerful, optimistic, warm, caring, relaxed, not combative, calm, composed, not easily upset, sensitive to the needs of others, patient, lenient, accepting of others, open to suggestions, and trusting of others.

The findings of the data were surprising due to societal stereotyping of the female as the warm and nurturing gender. Two possible explanations of the data come to mind: 1) female deans, in an effort not to appear weak or easy in a disciplinarian role, overcompensate and are perceived as colder and more rigid than men, and 2) the deans' position may attract a stronger, tougher type of woman than do other administrative positions. The author's conclusions were borne out in conversations with the five female deans in the study. They felt that the explanations offered were likely to be accurate.

Hypothesis III

Null hypothesis III states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to relationships, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis III was addressed by responses to survey questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 25, 30, 31, and 33. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample follow. Table 21 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 22 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 23 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 24 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. Table 25 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 26 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as be male and female respondents.

EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS			
Relationships N = 86			
16.	M: 4.55	SD: .69	Listen to others
17.	M: 4.57	SD: .80	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 4.20	SD: .86	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 4.22	SD: .98	Involve self with others
22.	M: 4.44	SD: .66	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.80	SD: .96	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 4.54	SD: .74	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 4.51	SD: .83	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.92	SD: .98	Share making of decisions with others
TOTAL	M: 4.34	SD: .59	

Table 21

The mean score for Expectations of Relationships was 4.34; the highest score possible was a 5.00. The mean scores for the individual questions ranged from a low of 3.80 to a high of 4.57.

<p align="center">PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS</p>

<p align="center">Relationships N = 86</p>

16.	M: 4.02	SD: .96	Listen to others
17.	M: 3.94	SD: 1.08	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 3.56	SD: 1.02	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 3.78	SD: 1.14	Involve self with others
22.	M: 3.87	SD: .97	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.36	SD: 1.03	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.03	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 3.84	SD: 1.22	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.68	SD: 1.07	Share making of decisions with others
TOTAL	M: 3.86	SD: .73	

Table 22

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the Relationships cluster mean score was 3.86. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.36 to 4.02.

In the teachers' perception, the female deans scored lower than expectation on every question.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS			
Relationships N = 86			

16.	M: 4.10	SD: .82	Listen to others
17.	M: 4.10	SD: 1.07	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 3.63	SD: .89	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 3.86	SD: .95	Involve self with others
22.	M: 3.95	SD: .86	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.69	SD: .91	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 3.93	SD: .90	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 4.07	SD: .96	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.78	SD: .99	Share making of decisions with others
TOTAL	M: 3.97	SD: 1.10	

Table 23

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for the Relationships cluster was 3.97. This was lower than the Expectation score, which was 4.34. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.63 to 4.10.

In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored lower than expectation on every questions. In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored slightly higher than the female deans on every question. That is, the male deans were considered to be slightly more able to: listen to others, avoid putting people down, analyze own behavior, involve self with others, recognize others' accomplishments, allows others freedom to act, reward

others for their appropriate behavior, not attempt to blame others when problems arise, and share making of decisions with others.

<p align="center">COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS</p>

<p align="center">Total Sample N = 86</p>

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
III. Relationships	4.34	.59	3.86	.73	3.97	1.10

Table 24

In summary, with regard to Relationships, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.34. The teachers perceived the male deans as very slightly closer to expectation than the female deans; the male deans had a perceptions score of 3.97, and the female deans had a perceptions score of 3.86.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By School Relationships</p>

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	82	5.01	3.60
School A	17	7.47	4.65
School B	21	.43	.67
School C	14	5.14	4.29
School D	17	7.82	4.41
School E	13	5.38	2.54

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 25

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Relationships and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 5.01, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 3.60. The male deans were considered slightly more effective than the female deans with regard to Relationships.

At four of the five selected schools, the male dean was at least slightly more effective than the female dean. At one school, the female and male deans were virtually equal in effectiveness.

At School A, the female dean had an effectiveness score of 7.47 compared to the male dean's score of 4.65; the male dean was slightly more effective.

At School B, the female and male deans were virtually equal; their scores were also much closer to expectation than deans at the other for schools. The faculty at School B considers their deans to be quite effective.

At School C, the male dean's score of 4.29 indicates slightly more effectiveness than the female dean whose score was 5.14.

At School D, the male dean had a score of 4.41. The female dean's score was 7.82, indicating that the male dean was more effective than the female dean.

At School E, the male dean's score of 2.54 indicates greater effectiveness than the female dean with a score of 5.38.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Female and Male Respondents Relationships</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Total Sample	82	5.01	3.60
Female Respondents	43	4.77	3.51
Male Respondents	39	5.28	3.69 **
School A	17	7.47	4.65
Female Respondents	7	6.00	4.86
Male Respondents	10	8.50	4.50
School B	21	.43	.67
Female Respondents	12	.17	.92
Male Respondents	9	.78	.33
School C	14	5.14	4.29
Female Respondents	9	4.33	3.78
Male Respondents	5	6.60	5.20
School D	17	7.82	4.41
Female Respondents	7	9.14	9.14
Male Respondents	10	6.90	4.50
School E	13	5.38	2.54
Female Respondents	8	7.25	1.00
Male Respondents	5	2.40	5.00

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 26

Table 26 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, the male teachers rated the male deans as significantly more effective than the female deans. The female teachers also rated the male deans as more effective than the female deans, although the difference was not as significant.

At School A, the male dean was rated as more effective by both female and male teachers.

At School B, there was virtually no difference in rating of the female and male deans by either female or male teachers. The deans' effectiveness scores at School B are again noteworthy for their closeness to expectation.

At School C, the male dean was considered slightly more effective than the female dean by both male and female teachers. The female teachers, however, rated the female and male dean slightly better than did the male teachers.

At School D, the female teachers rated both the male and female dean exactly alike, with a poor effectiveness score of 9.14. The male teachers were slightly more generous, although they rated the male dean slightly more effective than the female dean.

At School E, the female teachers rated the male dean as much more effective than the female dean. The male teachers, on the other hand, rated the female dean as slightly more effective than the male dean.

In summary, null hypothesis III states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to relationships, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is rejected; the data showed a significant (.05) difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to relationships. The data showed the male deans were significantly more effective than female deans in being able to avoid putting people down, listening to others, analyzing own behavior, involving self with others, recognizing others' accomplishments, allowing others freedom to act, rewarding others for their appropriate behavior, not attempting to blame others when problems arise, and sharing decision-making with others.

As with caring personal characteristics, the finding that male deans were more effective with regard to relationships than female deans was surprising. The two possible explanations, i.e. women overcompensating in an effort not to appear weak or easy, and the type of woman attracted to the dean's position, appear to fit here also.

Hypothesis IV

Null hypothesis IV states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to cultural leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis IV addressed the responses to survey questions 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample follow. Table 27 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 28 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 29 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 30 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. Table 31 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 32 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for male and female respondents.

EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS			
Cultural Leadership N = 86			
37.	M: 4.76	SD: .75	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.71	SD: .66	Perception that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 4.08	SD: .84	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.63	SD: .74	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 4.59	SD: .79	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 4.14	SD: .89	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.64	SD: .72	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.63	SD: .75	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 4.41	SD: .86	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities
TOTAL	M: 4.31	SD: 1.02	

Table 27

The mean score for Expectations of Cultural Leadership was 4.31; the highest score possible was 5.00. The mean scores for the individual questions ranged from a low of 4.08 to a high of 4.76.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS			
Cultural Leadership N = 86			

37.	M: 4.32	SD: .84	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.30	SD: .84	Perception that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 3.87	SD: 1.05	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.11	SD: .99	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 3.94	SD: 1.09	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 3.73	SD: 1.02	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.31	SD: .91	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.11	SD: .92	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 3.82	SD: .98	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activity
TOTAL	M: 3.95	SD: 1.02	

Table 28

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the cluster mean score was 3.95. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.73 to 4.32.

In the teachers' perceptions, the female deans scored lower than expectation on every question.

<p align="center">PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS Cultural Leadership N = 86</p>

37.	M: 4.28	SD: .88	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.26	SD: .94	Perception that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 3.91	SD: .95	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.06	SD: 1.11	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 4.06	SD: 1.03	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 3.65	SD: .94	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.31	SD: .87	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.15	SD: .99	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 3.92	SD: 1.02	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities
TOTAL	M: 3.87	SD: 1.07	

Table 29

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for Cultural Leadership was 3.87. This was slightly slower than the Expectation score, which was 4.31. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from a low of 3.65 to a high of 4.31.

In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored lower than expectation on every questions. There was no significant difference between the perceptions of the male deans and the female deans with regard to

Cultural Leadership, i.e. the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains others' commitments to the aims, goals, and mission of the organization as well as the extent to which the administrator helps others develop a sense of community and maintain a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.

COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS						
Total Sample N = 86						

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
IV. Cultural Leadership	4.31	1.02	3.95	1.02	3.87	1.07

Table 30

In summary, with regard to Cultural Leadership, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.31. Although both the male and female deans were slightly below expectation, the teachers perceived no significant difference between the two; the female deans mean score was 3.95 while the male deans mean score was 3.87.

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Schools Cultural Leadership

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	80	3.87	3.94
School A	16	5.62	5.69
School B	20	.85	.45
School C	15	2.93	3.67
School D	15	5.87	6.87
School E	14	5.07	4.07

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 31

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Cultural Leadership and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 3.87, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 3.94. There was no significant difference in effectiveness between the male and female deans.

None of the five selected schools indicated any significant difference in effectiveness between male and female deans with regard to Cultural Leadership. The only significant scores were those of the deans at School B; they rated extremely close to expectation again for this cluster.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Female and Male Respondents Cultural Leadership</p>

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Total Sample	80	3.87	3.94
Female Respondents	41	3.61	3.83
Male Respondents	39	4.15	4.05
School A	16	5.62	5.69
Female Respondents	6	5.33	7.00
Male Respondents	10	5.80	4.90
School B	20	.85	.45
Female Respondents	11	.45	.64
Male Respondents	9	1.33	.22
School C	15	2.93	3.67
Female Respondents	9	1.00	2.44
Male Respondents	6	5.83	5.50
School D	15	5.87	6.87
Female Respondents	7	7.71	10.00
Male Respondents	8	4.25	4.12
School E	14	5.07	4.07
Female Respondents	8	6.00	2.00
Male Respondents	6	3.83	6.83

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 32

Table 32 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, there was no significant difference in how female and male teachers rated the male and female deans; the female teachers rated both the female and male deans slightly better than the male teachers.

At School A, the female teachers rated the female dean slightly more effective than the male dean. The male teachers rated the male dean very slightly more effective.

At School B, the effectiveness rating for both deans by the female teachers was nearly equal. The male teachers, however, rated the male dean as slightly more effective than the female dean.

At School C, the female teachers rated both the female and male deans more effective than the male teachers rated them.

At School D, the female respondents rated both the female and male deans as less effective than the male teachers rated them.

At School E, the female teachers rated the male dean more effective, while the male teachers rated the female dean more effective.

In summary, null hypothesis IV states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to cultural leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is true and retained.

Hypothesis V

Null hypothesis V states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to personal challenge, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis V addressed the responses to survey questions 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, and 36. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample follow. Table 33 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 34 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 35 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 36 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. Table 37 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 37 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as be male and female respondents.

EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS			
Personal Challenge N = 86			
24.	M: 4.33	SD: .82	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 4.34	SD: .79	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 2.23	SD: 1.19	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 4.24	SD: .95	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 4.71	SD: .81	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 4.70	SD: .53	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 4.05	SD: 1.09	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 4.55	SD: .74	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.49	SD: .80	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
TOTAL	M: 4.18	SD: .36	

Table 33

The mean score for Expectations of Personal Challenge was 4.18; the highest score possible was 5.00. The mean score for the individual questions ranged from a low of 2.23 to a high of 4.71.

A noteworthy score in this cluster is the mean score of 2.23 for Question #27: Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their

own needs. This is the lowest mean expectation score of any question in the survey.

The highest mean score in this cluster is for Question #29: Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds. There is a high level of expectation, 4.71, in this area. This is understandable since it is directly related to discipline effectiveness.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS			
Personal Challenge N = 86			

24.	M: 3.84	SD: .89	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 4.07	SD: .96	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 2.44	SD: 1.06	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 3.88	SD: .99	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 4.17	SD: 1.03	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 3.78	SD: 1.08	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 3.70	SD: 1.02	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 3.94	SD: .98	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.09	SD: .96	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
TOTAL	M: 3.77	SD: .57	

Table 34

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the cluster mean score was 3.77. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 2.44 to 4.17.

In the teachers' perceptions, the female deans scored lower than expectation on every question with the exception of #27, Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs. This question had a mean

perceptions score of 2.44, very slightly higher than the mean expectations score.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS			
Personal Challenge N = 86			

24.	M: 3.77	SD: .86	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 3.92	SD: .95	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 3.36	SD: 1.05	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 3.91	SD: .86	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 3.80	SD: 1.30	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 3.73	SD: 1.00	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 3.60	SD: 1.01	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 4.00	SD: .87	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.12	SD: .87	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
TOTAL	M: 3.81	SD: .64	

Table 35

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for the Personal Challenge cluster was 3.81. This was slightly lower than the Expectation score, which was 4.18. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.36 to 4.12.

In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored lower than expectation on every question except #27, Develop others who put the welfare

of others ahead of their own needs. The male dean scored lower than the female deans on five questions: expand growth opportunities for others, welcome change/focus on the future, be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds, encourage feedback on own performance, and develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others. They scored higher than the female deans on four questions: develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs, encourage others to trust their own judgment, recognize the accomplishments of others, and encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems. None of the differences in scores, however, were statistically significant.

COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

Total Sample N = 86

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
V. Personal Challenge	4.18	.36	3.77	.57	3.81	.64

Table 36

In summary, with regard to Personal Challenge, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.18. Both the male and female deans were perceived by the teachers as slightly below expectation. The teachers gave the female deans a perceptions score of 3.77; they gave the male deans a score of 3.81. There is no significant difference between the teachers perceptions of the female or male deans in terms of Personal Challenge.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By School Personal Challenge</p>

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	76	3.74	3.85
School A	15	3.73	4.60
School B	19	.79	1.05
School C	13	4.23	3.85
School D	16	6.44	6.69
School E	13	4.23	3.51

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 37

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Personal Challenge and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 3.74, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 3.85. There is no significant difference between these two scores.

At three schools, School A, School B, and School D, the female dean was very slightly more effective than the male dean. The male dean was very slightly more effective than the female dean at School C and School E.

School B is significant in this cluster area also because of their very high degree of effectiveness; the female dean had a score of .79 and the male dean, 1.05.

<p>EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents Personal Challenge</p>

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	76	3.74	3.85
Female Respondents	39	3.72	4.08
Male Respondents	37	3.76	3.62
School A	15	3.73	4.60
Female Respondents	5	3.40	4.80
Male Respondents	10	3.73	4.50
School B	19	.79	1.05
Female Respondents	12	.17	.92
Male Respondents	7	1.86	1.29
School C	13	4.23	3.85
Female Respondents	7	3.57	3.71
Male Respondents	6	5.00	4.00
School D	16	6.44	6.69
Female Respondents	7	7.29	9.71
Male Respondents	9	5.78	4.33
School E	13	4.23	3.51
Female Respondents	8	6.25	3.75
Male Respondents	5	1.00	3.40

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 38

Table 38 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, the female deans were rated virtually the same by both the male and female teachers. The male deans were rated slightly more effective by the male respondents.

At School A, the female dean was rated slightly more effective than the male dean by both female and male teachers.

At School B, the female dean was rated as more effective than the male dean by the female teachers; the male teachers, however, rated the male dean as slightly more effective.

At School C, the female teachers rated both deans virtually equal. The male teachers rated the male dean as slightly more effective than the female dean.

At School D, the female teachers gave rather poor effectiveness scores to both the male dean and the female dean, 9.71 and 7.29 respectively. The male teachers rated neither dean as poorly as did the female teachers, although the male teachers rated the male dean slightly better than the female dean.

At School E, the female teachers rated the female dean rather poorly, 6.25; the male teachers rated the female dean quite well, 1.00. The male dean was rated virtually the same by both male and female teachers.

In summary, null hypothesis V states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to

personal challenge, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is true and retained.

Hypothesis VI

Null hypothesis VI states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to quality leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile.

Null hypothesis VI addressed the responses to survey questions 46, 47, 38, 49, and 50. Tables detailing each question's mean score and standard deviation for the total sample follow. Table 39 delineates Expectations of Deans, Table 40 describes Perceptions of Selected Female Deans, and Table 41 shows Perceptions of Selected Male Deans. Table 42 summarizes a comparison of the mean scores and standard deviations for both expectations and perceptions. Table 43 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as for each individual school. Table 44 lists the effectiveness scores of male and female deans for the total sample as well as be male and female respondents.

EXPECTATIONS OF DEANS			
Quality Leadership N = 86			
46.	M: 4.53	SD: .74	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.57	SD: .73	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 4.46	SD: .82	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.40	SD: .84	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.49	SD: .81	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school
TOTAL	M: 4.49	SD: .68	

Table 39

The mean score for Expectations of Quality Leadership was 4.49; the highest possible score was 5.00. The mean scores for the individual questions ranged from a low of 4.40 to a high of 4.57.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED FEMALE DEANS			
Quality Leadership N = 86			

46.	M: 4.05	SD: 1.00	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.07	SD: .99	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 3.72	SD: 1.13	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.08	SD: 1.05	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.10	SD: 1.08	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school
TOTAL	M: 4.02	SD: .89	

Table 40

With regard to Perceptions of the female deans in this study, the cluster mean score was 4.02, slightly below Expectation. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.72 to 4.10.

In the teachers' perception, the female deans scored slightly below expectation on every question.

PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED MALE DEANS			
Quality Leadership N = 86			
46.	M: 3.93	SD: .93	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.08	SD: .95	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 3.79	SD: 1.06	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.02	SD: 1.06	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.15	SD: .93	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school
TOTAL	M: 4.00	SD: .87	

Table 41

With regard to Perceptions of the male deans in this study, the mean score for Quality Leadership was 4.00, slightly below Expectation of 4.49, but virtually equal to the female deans score of 4.02. The mean scores for individual questions ranged from 3.79 to 4.15.

In the teachers' perception, the male deans scored slightly lower than expectation on every question. In the teachers' perception, there was no significant difference between male deans and female deans with regard to Quality Leadership, i.e. the extent to which the administrator creates and

maintains an environment of self-improvement, organizational improvement, and commitment to learning.

COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS						
Total Sample N = 86						

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
VI. Quality Leadership	4.49	.68	4.02	.89	4.00	.87

Table 42

In summary, with regard to Quality Leadership, the mean score of the total sample for expectations was 4.49. Although both female and male deans were slightly below expectation, the teachers perceived no significant difference between the two in terms of Quality Leadership.

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and By School Quality Leadership</p>

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Total Sample	85	2.47	2.45
School A	17	3.82	3.00
School B	21	.05	.00
School C	16	1.81	3.19
School D	17	3.35	3.82
School E	14	4.14	2.93

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 43

Effectiveness is measured by subtracting the teachers' perceptions of each dean from the teachers' expectations of an effective dean, thus:

Female Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Female Dean, and

Male Dean Effectiveness = Expectation - Perception of Male Dean.

A "+" difference between expectation and perception indicates that expectation was greater than perception. A smaller "+" mean indicates greater effectiveness, whereas a larger "-" mean indicates greater effectiveness.

With regard to Quality Leadership and the total sample, the female deans had an effectiveness score of 2.47, and the male deans had an effectiveness score of 2.45. Thus, there was no significant difference between the two in terms of effectiveness.

The male dean was considered slightly more effective at two schools, School A and School E. The female dean was considered slightly more effective at School C and School D. The male and female deans were virtually equal at School B, which is again notable for its very high degree of effectiveness, the female dean's score was .05, and the male dean's score was .00.

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS
By Total Sample and By Female and Male Respondents
Quality Leadership

	<u>N</u>	Mean Score	
		<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Total Sample	85	2.47	2.45
Female Respondents	43	2.44	3.00
Male Respondents	42	2.50	1.88
School A	17	3.82	3.00
Female Respondents	7	3.86	5.29
Male Respondents	10	3.80	1.40
School B	21	.05	.00
Female Respondents	12	-.33	-.08
Male Respondents	9	.56	.11
School C	16	1.81	3.19
Female Respondents	9	1.22	3.00
Male Respondents	7	2.57	3.43
School D	17	3.35	3.82
Female Respondents	7	4.14	6.14
Male Respondents	10	2.80	2.20
School E	14	4.14	2.93
Female Respondents	8	5.25	2.87
Male Respondents	6	2.67	3.00

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

Table 44

Table 44 shows a comparison of how female and male respondents rated the male and female deans. Within the total sample, the female teachers rated the female dean slightly more effective, while the male teachers rated the male dean slightly more effective.

At School A, the female teachers rated the female dean slightly more effective, and the male teachers rated the male dean slightly more effective.

At School B, both male and female teachers rated both the male and female deans as very effective.

At School C, the female dean was rated slightly more effective by both the male and female teachers.

At School D, the female teachers rated the female dean as slightly more effective, while the male teachers rated the male dean as slightly more effective.

At School E, the female teachers rated the male dean as slightly more effective; the male teachers rated both the male and female deans virtually equal.

In summary, null hypothesis VI states: There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to quality leadership, as measured by the Basic Leadership Profile. This hypothesis is true and retained.

Summary

A survey instrument, the Basic Leadership Inventory, constructed by the Research and Service Institute, Inc. of Wichita, Kansas, consisting of two parts, was distributed to 25 male and 25 female teachers at five public DuPage County and suburban Cook County secondary schools.

Survey respondents answered Part I (Expectations) once. They then answered Part II (Perceptions) twice--once with regard to the female dean and a second time with regard to the male dean. The responses to the expectations form and the perceptions forms were compared to determine effectiveness. The effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean. The survey measures leadership skills in six clustered areas:

- Task/Initiating Structure: the extent to which the administrator recognizes and defines reality, identifies and solves problems, sets reasonable goals, takes actions, and focuses attention on the organization.
- Caring Personal Characteristics: the extent to which the administrator is viewed as: 1) being warm and caring, sensitive, open, and 2) having a sense of values and trust of others.
- Relationships: the extent to which the administrator: 1) listens to others, 2) recognizes the work of others, 3) shares decision-making with others, 4) is firm and consistent, and 5) is willing to examine his/her own actions. It also is the extent to which the administrator creates and

maintains an environment of: 1) trust and respect for individual integrity, 2) warmth and caring among individuals, and 3) fairness and empowerment.

- Cultural Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains others' commitments to the aims, goals, and mission of the organization. It also is the extent to which the administrator helps others develop a sense of community and maintain a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.
- Personal Challenge: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment for helping others develop personal and professional aims that lead to a sense of independence, responsibility, and selflessness.
- Quality Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of self-improvement, organizational improvement, and commitment to learning.

After six mean measures of effectiveness were obtained for each dean, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance was used to compare males and females on each of the six dimensions. The Repeated Measures ANOVA measures the within group change (i.e. how group of respondents changed from the male rating to the female rating) in order to see if the respondent rated the two deans significantly different. This analysis was performed for each school, as well as for the total sample.

The results for the total sample indicate that female and male deans were rated significantly different on three dimensions, Task/Initiating, Caring

Personal Characteristics and Relationships. While female deans scored significantly better on the Task/Initiating dimension, male deans were rated significantly more effective on the Caring Personal Characteristics and Relationships dimensions.

Within schools there were no significant differences between deans, but this is very likely due to the small within school sample sizes (the largest being 21).

There were no significant differences between male and female respondents, for the total sample, or within schools. In other words, male respondents did not rate the female or male deans significantly differently than did female respondents.

There were no significant differences between respondents with regard to years in teaching, years in teaching in current district, age, ethnic background, or highest educational level completed. This could be due to the small total sample.

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE – EXPECTATIONS Total Sample N = 86 (By Question)

I.	M: 4.53	SD: .26	Task/Initiating Structure
2.	M: 4.61	SD: .67	Persistent
7.	M: 4.70	SD: .85	Well-informed
9.	M: 4.11	SD: .92	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 4.77	SD: .47	Decisive
14.	M: 4.80	SD: .45	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 4.49	SD: .96	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.83	SD: .53	Follow through
21.	M: 4.82	SD: .45	Persevere
23.	M: 3.82	SD: .86	Do his/her own thinking
II.	M: 4.17	SD: .68	Caring Personal Characteristics
1.	M: 4.09	SD: .82	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.95	SD: 1.02	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.57	SD: .99	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 4.62	SD: .67	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 4.63	SD: .53	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.08	SD: 1.01	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 4.17	SD: .85	Accepting of others
11.	M: 4.44	SD: .84	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.53	SD: .98	Trusting of others

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE – EXPECTATIONS

III.	M: 4.34	SD: .59	Relationships
16.	M: 4.55	SD: .69	Listen to others
17.	M: 4.57	SD: .80	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 4.20	SD: .86	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 4.22	SD: .98	Involve self with others
22.	M: 4.44	SD: .66	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.80	SD: .96	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 4.54	SD: .74	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 4.51	SD: .83	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.92	SD: .98	Share making of decisions with others
IV.	M: 4.31	SD: 1.02	Cultural Leadership
37.	M: 4.76	SD: .75	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.71	SD: .66	Perceptions that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 4.08	SD: .84	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.63	SD: .74	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 4.59	SD: .79	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 4.14	SD: .89	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.64	SD: .72	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.63	SD: .75	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 4.41	SD: .86	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities

Table 45 - 2 of 3

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- EXPECTATIONS

V.	M: 4.18	SD: .36	Personal Challenge
24.	M: 4.33	SD: .82	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 4.34	SD: .79	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 2.23	SD: 1.19	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 4.24	SD: .95	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 4.71	SD: .81	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 4.70	SD: .53	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 4.05	SD: 1.09	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 4.55	SD: .74	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.49	SD: .80	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
VI.	M: 4.49	SD: .68	Quality Leadership
46.	M: 4.53	SD: .74	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.57	SD: .73	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 4.46	SD: .82	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.40	SD: .84	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.49	SD: .81	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school

Table 45 - 3 of 3

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE DEANS

Total Sample N = 86

(By Question)

I.	M: 4.05	SD: .48	Task/Initiating Structure
2.	M: 4.25	SD: .70	Persistent
7.	M: 4.18	SD: .99	Well-informed
9.	M: 3.92	SD: 1.03	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 4.29	SD: .87	Decisive
14.	M: 4.29	SD: .85	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 3.99	SD: 1.09	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.24	SD: .94	Follow through
21.	M: 4.34	SD: .74	Persevere
23.	M: 3.90	SD: .90	Do his/her own thinking
II.	M: 3.79	SD: .68	Caring Personal Characteristics
1.	M: 3.77	SD: .97	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.44	SD: 1.15	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.14	SD: 1.14	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 3.98	SD: 1.01	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 3.94	SD: .88	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.06	SD: .99	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 3.59	SD: 1.05	Accepting of others
11.	M: 3.87	SD: 1.11	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.21	SD: .92	Trusting of others

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE DEANS

III.	M: 3.86	SD: .73	Relationships
16.	M: 4.02	SD: .96	Listen to others
17.	M: 3.94	SD: 1.08	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 3.56	SD: 1.02	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 3.78	SD: 1.14	Involve self with others
22.	M: 3.87	SD: .97	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.36	SD: 1.03	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.03	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 3.84	SD: 1.22	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.68	SD: 1.07	Share making of decisions with others
IV.	M: 3.95	SD: 1.02	Cultural Leadership
37.	M: 4.32	SD: .84	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.30	SD: .84	Perceptions that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 3.87	SD: 1.05	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.11	SD: .99	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 3.94	SD: 1.09	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 3.73	SD: 1.02	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.31	SD: .91	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.11	SD: .92	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 3.82	SD: .98	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities

Table 46 - 2 of 3

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE DEANS

V.	M: 3.77	SD: .57	Personal Challenge
24.	M: 3.84	SD: .89	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 4.07	SD: .96	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 2.44	SD: 1.06	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 3.88	SD: .99	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 4.17	SD: 1.03	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 3.78	SD: 1.08	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 3.70	SD: 1.02	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 3.94	SD: .98	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.09	SD: .96	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
VI.	M: 4.02	SD: .89	Quality Leadership
46.	M: 4.05	SD: 1.00	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.07	SD: .99	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 3.72	SD: 1.13	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.08	SD: 1.05	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.10	SD: 1.08	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school

Table 46 - 3 of 3

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- PERCEPTIONS OF MALE DEANS
Total Sample N = 86
(By Question)

I.	M: 3.83	SD: .69	Task/Initiating Structure
2.	M: 3.95	SD: 1.15	Persistent
7.	M: 4.01	SD: 1.10	Well-informed
9.	M: 3.62	SD: 1.11	Aroused by challenge
13.	M: 3.97	SD: 1.13	Decisive
14.	M: 4.13	SD: 1.00	Identify/solve problems
15.	M: 3.90	SD: 1.00	Plan ahead
20.	M: 4.13	SD: .96	Follow through
21.	M: 4.20	SD: .96	Persevere
23.	M: 3.69	SD: .97	Do his/her own thinking
 II.	 M: 3.74	 SD: .68	 Caring Personal Characteristics
1.	M: 3.86	SD: 1.05	Cheerful, optimistic
3.	M: 3.60	SD: 1.03	Warm, caring
4.	M: 3.56	SD: 1.10	Relaxed, not combative
5.	M: 4.17	SD: .94	Calm, composed, not easily upset
6.	M: 3.98	SD: .92	Sensitive to the needs of others
8.	M: 3.33	SD: 1.10	Patient, lenient
10.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.02	Accepting of others
11.	M: 3.85	SD: 1.05	Open to suggestions
12.	M: 3.31	SD: .93	Trusting of others

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE -- PERCEPTIONS OF MALE DEANS

III.	M: 3.97	SD: 1.10	Relationships
16.	M: 4.10	SD: .82	Listen to others
17.	M: 4.10	SD: 1.07	Avoid putting people down
18.	M: 3.63	SD: .89	Often analyze own behavior
19.	M: 3.86	SD: .95	Involve self with others
22.	M: 3.95	SD: .86	Recognize others' accomplishments
25.	M: 3.69	SD: .91	Allow others freedom to act
30.	M: 3.93	SD: .90	Reward others for their appropriate behavior
31.	M: 4.07	SD: .96	Not attempt to blame other when problems arise
33.	M: 3.78	SD: .99	Share making of decisions with others
IV.	M: 3.87	SD: 1.07	Cultural Leadership
37.	M: 4.28	SD: .88	A clear understanding of the aims of the organization
38.	M: 4.26	SD: .94	Perceptions that the administrator supports the learning and work
39.	M: 3.91	SD: .95	A norm for people to go beyond the call of duty
40.	M: 4.06	SD: 1.11	Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events
41.	M: 4.06	SD: 1.03	Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization
42.	M: 3.65	SD: .94	Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation
43.	M: 4.31	SD: .87	A strong commitment to the aims of the organization
44.	M: 4.15	SD: .99	Genuine attention to both detail and quality
45.	M: 3.92	SD: 1.02	Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities

Table 47 - 2 of 3

BASIC LEADERSHIP PROFILE – PERCEPTIONS OF MALE DEANS

V.	M: 3.81	SD: .64	Personal Challenge
24.	M: 3.77	SD: .86	Expand growth opportunities for others
26.	M: 3.92	SD: .95	Welcome change, focus on the future
27.	M: 3.36	SD: 1.05	Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs
28.	M: 3.91	SD: .86	Encourage others to trust their own judgment
29.	M: 3.80	SD: 1.30	Be consistent and firm in response to misdeeds
32.	M: 3.73	SD: 1.00	Encourage feedback on own performance
34.	M: 3.60	SD: 1.01	Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others
35.	M: 4.00	SD: .87	Recognize the accomplishments of others
36.	M: 4.12	SD: .87	Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems
VI.	M: 4.00	SD: .87	Quality Leadership
46.	M: 3.93	SD: .93	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself
47.	M: 4.08	SD: .95	A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization
48.	M: 3.79	SD: 1.06	A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement
49.	M: 4.02	SD: 1.06	A strong commitment to improvement and learning
50.	M: 4.15	SD: .93	A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school

<p style="text-align: center;">COMPARISON OF EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS</p>

By Cluster

Total Sample N = 86

	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Perceptions Female Deans</u>		<u>Perceptions Male Deans</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
I. Task/Initiating Structure	4.53	.26	4.05	.48	3.83	.69
II. Caring Personal Characteristics	4.17	.68	3.79	.68	3.74	.68
III. Relationships	4.34	.59	3.86	.73	3.97	1.10
IV. Cultural Leadership	4.31	1.02	3.95	1.02	3.87	1.07
V. Personal Challenge	4.18	.36	3.77	.57	3.81	.64
VI. Quality Leadership	4.49	.68	4.02	.89	4.00	.87

Table 48

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Cluster Total Sample N = 86

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating Total Sample	86	3.52 **	5.36
Caring Personal Characteristics Total Sample	83	3.93	2.42 **
Relationship Total Sample	82	5.01	3.60 **
Cultural Leadership Total Sample	80	3.87	3.94
Personal Challenge Total Sample	76	3.74	3.85
Quality Leadership Total Sample	85	2.47	2.45

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 49

<p align="center">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents By Cluster</p>

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	
		<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	86	3.52 **	5.36
Female Respondents	45	2.35	5.64
Male Respondents	41	4.80	5.05
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	83	3.93	2.42
Female Respondents	44	3.95	2.07
Male Respondents	39	3.90	2.82 **
Relationship			
Total Sample	82	5.01	3.60
Female Respondents	43	4.77	3.51
Male Respondents	39	5.28	3.69 **
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	80	3.87	3.94
Female Respondents	41	3.61	3.83
Male Respondents	39	4.15	4.05
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	76	3.74	3.85
Female Respondents	39	3.72	4.08
Male Respondents	37	3.76	3.62
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	85	2.47	2.45
Female Respondents	43	2.44	3.00
Male Respondents	42	2.50	1.88

++ Effectiveness = Expectations - Perceptions

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 50

<p align="center">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents School A N = 17</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Dean</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	17	4.47	5.58
Female Respondents	7	2.00	5.14
Male Respondents	10	6.20	5.90
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	16	6.12	3.75
Female Respondents	7	5.57	4.00
Male Respondents	9	6.56	3.56
Relationship			
Total Sample	17	7.47	4.65
Female Respondents	7	6.00	4.86
Male Respondents	10	8.50	4.50
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	16	5.62	5.69
Female Respondents	6	5.33	7.00
Male Respondents	10	5.80	4.90
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	15	3.73	4.60
Female Respondents	5	3.40	4.80
Male Respondents	10	3.73	4.50
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	17	3.82	3.00
Female Respondents	7	3.86	5.29
Male Respondents	10	3.80	1.40

Table 51

<p align="center">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents School B N = 21</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	21	.57	1.33
Female Respondents	12	-.58	1.17
Male Respondents	9	2.11	1.56
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	19	1.58	1.10
Female Respondents	11	.81	.91
Male Respondents	8	2.62	1.37
Relationship			
Total Sample	21	.43	.67
Female Respondents	12	.17	.92
Male Respondents	9	.78	.33
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	20	.85	.45
Female Respondents	11	.45	.64
Male Respondents	9	1.33	.22
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	19	.79	1.05
Female Respondents	12	.17	.92
Male Respondents	7	1.86	1.29
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	21	.05	.00
Female Respondents	12	-.33	-.08
Male Respondents	9	.56	.11

Table 52

<p align="center">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents School C N = 16</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	16	4.37	6.37
Female Respondents	9	2.00	5.79
Male Respondents	7	7.43	7.14
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	16	3.44	3.87
Female Respondents	9	3.33	3.22
Male Respondents	7	3.57	4.71
Relationship			
Total Sample	14	5.14	4.29
Female Respondents	9	4.33	3.78
Male Respondents	5	6.60	5.20
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	15	2.93	3.67
Female Respondents	9	1.00	2.44
Male Respondents	6	5.83	5.50
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	13	4.23	3.85
Female Respondents	7	3.57	3.71
Male Respondents	6	5.00	4.00
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	16	1.81	3.19
Female Respondents	9	1.22	3.00
Male Respondents	7	2.57	3.43

Table 53

<p style="text-align: center;">EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS By School Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents School D N = 18</p>

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	18	6.00	11.83
Female Respondents	9	5.67	15.22**
Male Respondents	9	6.33	8.44
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	18	4.61	1.50
Female Respondents	9	4.56	2.00
Male Respondents	9	4.67	1.00
Relationship			
Total Sample	17	7.82	4.41
Female Respondents	7	9.14	9.14
Male Respondents	10	6.90	4.50
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	15	5.87	6.87
Female Respondents	7	7.71	10.00
Male Respondents	8	4.25	4.12
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	16	6.44	6.69
Female Respondents	7	7.29	9.71
Male Respondents	9	5.78	4.33
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	17	3.35	3.82
Female Respondents	7	4.14	6.14
Male Respondents	10	2.80	2.20

** significant, alpha = .05

Table 54

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEMALE AND MALE DEANS
By School Total Sample and Female and Male Respondents
School E N = 14

		Mean Score	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Female Dean</u>	<u>Male Dean</u>
Task/Initiating			
Total Sample	14	2.64	1.64
Female Respondents	8	3.75	1.87
Male Respondents	6	1.17	1.33
Caring Personal Characteristics			
Total Sample	14	4.29	2.21
Female Respondents	8	6.87	.75
Male Respondents	6	.83	4.17
Relationship			
Total Sample	13	5.38	2.54
Female Respondents	8	7.25	1.00
Male Respondents	5	2.40	5.00
Cultural Leadership			
Total Sample	14	5.07	4.07
Female Respondents	8	6.00	2.00
Male Respondents	6	3.83	6.83
Personal Challenge			
Total Sample	13	4.23	3.51
Female Respondents	8	6.25	3.75
Male Respondents	5	1.00	3.40
Quality Leadership			
Total Sample	14	4.14	2.93
Female Respondents	8	5.25	2.87
Male Respondents	6	2.67	3.00

Table 55

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V begins with a discussion of the problem and the purpose for the study. The hypotheses are then detailed and the instrument explained. A summary of the analysis of the data is followed by major findings of this study. The chapter concludes with implications for practice and recommendations for further study.

The Problem

Much research has been done regarding the effectiveness of women in school leadership, although most of the dissertations and research have focused on women in principalships or superintendencies.

Hassan Esau Mamma's Ed.D. dissertation, written in 1987 at George Washington University, measured teachers' attitudes toward women's ability to succeed in school administrative positions. The data showed that women were given "favorable ratings in almost all factors considered necessary for success in school administration, except for emotional and stress factors. These factors were considered key for school discipline, and therefore it was thought that women could not cope with school behavioral management." This study directly measured the accuracy of that conclusion.

The Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine whether gender plays a role in discipline effectiveness in the secondary schools. The researcher assessed suburban secondary school teachers' expectations for discipline in their schools and then their perceptions of the disciplinary actions of female and male deans of students who have responsibility for discipline. Using the measures of expectations and perceptions, the researcher derived a correlation regarding the effectiveness of male versus female deans in charge of discipline.

The Hypotheses

The researcher assumed the following null hypotheses:

- (a) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to task/initiating structure, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- (b) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to caring personal characteristics, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- (c) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to relationships, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- (d) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to cultural leadership, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- (e) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to personal challenge, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.
- (f) There will be no significant difference between the effectiveness of male and female deans with regard to quality leadership, as defined by the Basic Leadership Profile.

The Instrument

The researcher obtained permission to use the survey instrument, Basic Leadership Inventory, constructed by the Research and Service Institute, Inc. of Wichita, Kansas. The survey had been normed and validated and consisted of two parts.

Part I consisted of 50 Likert-type statements designed to assess teachers' expectations for the dean's position with regard to discipline. Part II consisted of 50 Likert-type statements designed to identify teachers' perceptions of the individual holding the position with regard to discipline.

Survey respondents answered Part I (Expectations) once. They then answered Part II (Perceptions) twice--once with regard to the female dean and a second time with regard to the male dean. The responses to the expectations form and the perceptions forms were compared to determine effectiveness. The effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean. The survey measured leadership skills in six clustered areas:

- Task/Initiating Structure: the extent to which the administrator recognizes and defines reality, identifies and solves problems, sets reasonable goals, takes actions, and focuses attention on the organization.

- Caring Personal Characteristics: the extent to which the administrator is viewed as: 1) being warm and caring, sensitive, open, and 2) having a sense of values and trust of others.
- Relationships: the extent to which the administrator: 1) listens to others, 2) recognizes the work of others, 3) shares decision-making with others, 4) is firm and consistent, and 5) is willing to examine his/her own actions. It also is the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of: 1) trust and respect for individual integrity, 2) warmth and caring among individuals, and 3) fairness and empowerment.
- Cultural Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains others' commitments to the aims, goals, and mission of the organization. It also is the extent to which the administrator helps others develop a sense of community and maintain a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.
- Personal Challenge: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment for helping others develop personal and professional aims that lead to a sense of independence, responsibility, and selflessness.
- Quality Leadership: the extent to which the administrator creates and maintains an environment of self-improvement, organizational improvement, and commitment to learning.

Data Analysis

The first step of the analysis of the data involved deriving a measure of discipline effectiveness for the female and male dean of each participating school on six dimensions: Task/Initiating Structure, Caring Personal Characteristics, Relationships, Cultural Leadership, Personal Challenge, and Quality Leadership. This effectiveness measure was derived by subtracting the respondents' perceptions of each dean from the respondents' expectations of an effective dean, on each dimension. Then the mean discipline effectiveness score was obtained for each school as well as for the total sample.

After six mean measures of effectiveness were obtained for each dean, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance was used to compare males and females on each of the six dimensions. This analysis was performed for each school, as well as for the total sample.

Conclusions

The results for the total sample indicate that female and male deans were rated significantly different on three dimensions, Task/Initiating, Caring Personal Characteristics and Relationships. While female deans were rated significantly more effective on the Task/Initiating dimension, male deans were rated significantly more effective on the Caring Personal Characteristics and Relationships dimensions.

Within schools there were no significant differences between deans, but this is very likely due to the small within school sample sizes (the largest being 21).

There were no significant differences between male and female respondents, for the total sample, or within schools. In other words, there were no significant differences in the ways male respondents and female respondents rated the male and female deans.

There were no significant differences between respondents with regard to years in teaching, years in teaching in current district, age, ethnic background, or highest educational level completed. This could be due to the small total sample.

Implications for Practice

This study revealed that overall female deans perform as capably in their job responsibilities as do male deans. It is hoped that a growing number of women will apply for positions as secondary school deans. Women in these positions can accomplish four things: 1) they can perform their job duties effectively, 2) they can take a first step into the ranks of school administration, 3) they can serve as role models for other women in the teaching profession as well as for female students, and 4) they can help to break down gender-based stereotypes and biases.

It is further hoped that secondary school administrators responsible for hiring deans will more often expand their search to include women.

Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for further study include:

1. If this study were replicated on a larger sample group, how would the results compare?
2. Do urban teachers' expectations for male and female deans differ from suburban teachers' expectations for male and female deans?
3. Do urban teachers' perceptions of male and female deans differ from suburban teachers' perceptions of male and female deans?
4. What are the community's expectations and perceptions of male and female deans?
5. What are students' expectations and perceptions of the male and female deans?
6. What are male and female deans' perceptions of each other and of themselves?
7. How do male and female deans' perceptions of each other and of themselves compare to the perceptions of the teachers in their buildings?
8. Do teachers' expectations for the female dean differ from teachers' expectations for the male dean?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burns, James A. "Discipline: Why Does It Continue to Be a Problem? Solution is in Changing School Culture". NASSP Bulletin. 69, 479 (March 1985): 1-4.
- Calabrese, Raymond L. "Communication is the Key to Good Discipline". NASSP Bulletin. 69, 478 (February 1985): 109-110.
- Campbell, D. T. "Stereotypes and Perception of Group Differences", American Psychologist, 22, (1967), 817-829.
- Dejnozka, Edward L. and David E. Kapal. American Educators' Encyclopedia. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- DeLyon, Hilary and Frances Widdowson Migniuolo. Women Teachers: Issues and Experiences. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1989.
- Fishel, A. and J. Pottker, "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies", National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors Journal. 54 (Spring, 1975): 110-117.
- Freedman, Ira. "Women in Educational Administration." The Education Digest, March 1980)
- Friesen, L. "Women and Leadership" Contemporary Education, 54, (1983), 223-230.
- Fryer, Angela C. "A Checklist for the Successful Administrator." "NASSP Bulletin, (December 1980).
- Furtwengler, Willis J. and William Konnert. Improving School Discipline: An Administrator's Guide. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1982.
- Gale, Linda Lyman. "Gender and Leadership: The Implications of Small Group Research", Initiatives, 51, 4, (1988), 20.

- Gilligan, Carol In a Different Voice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, (1982.)
- Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, (1969).
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, (1973).
- Grace, Linda, and Robert Buser, and Dean Stuck, "What Works and What Doesn't: Characteristics of Outstanding Administrators", NASSP Bulletin, (November 1987), 72-76.
- Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, the University of Chicago, 1959.
- Haven, Elizabeth W. Women in Educational Administration: The Principalsip. A Literature Review. (Report No. EA 013 964). Annandale, VA: JWK International Corp. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208486). 1980.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Hollander, E.P. & Yoder, J. "Some Issues in Comparing Women and Men as Leaders" Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1, (1980), 277-280.
- Hunt, David E. "Conceptual Level Theory and Research as Guides to Educational Practice," Interchange 18, no. 4, 1977-78.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. Education for Justice in Moral Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Mamma, Hassan Esau, "A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers and School Administrators Toward Women's Ability to Succeed in School Administrative Positions." Ed.D. diss., the George Washington University, 1987.
- Nyquist, Ewald B. "The American No-Fault Morality," Phi Delta Kappan, 58, no. 3, 1976.

- Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgment of the Child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932.
- Porter, N., F. L. Geis, and J. Jennings, "Are Women Invisible as Leaders?" Sex Roles, 9, 1983.
- Reddin, William J. Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1970.
- Reed, B. G. "Women Leaders in Small Groups: Social-Psychological Perspectives and Strategies" Social Work With Groups, 6, 1983.
- Shakeshaft, Carol. "Theory in a Changing Reality." Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7, 1987.
- Taylor, Suzanne "The Attitudes of Superintendents and Boards of Education Members in Connecticut Toward the Employment and Effectiveness of Women Public School Administrators" (Doctoral diss., University of Connecticut, 1971).
- Tibbetts, S. L. "Why Don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education? In Berry, M.C. (Ed.) Women in Higher Education: A Book of Readings. Washington, DC: The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. (1979)
- Willower, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell, and Wayne K. Hoy. The School and Pupil Control Ideology, Penn State Studies. 2d ed. University Park, Pennsylvania: Penn State University, 1973.

PERSONAL DATA OF RESPONDENT

151

1. How many years have you been a teacher?

1 to 5 years . _____
6 to 10 years _____
11 to 15 years _____
16 to 20 years _____
21 to 25 years _____
25+ years _____

2. How many years have you been a teacher
in this district?

1 to 5 years _____
6 to 10 years _____
11 to 15 years _____
16 to 20 years _____
21 to 25 years _____
25+ years _____

3. What is your gender?

Male _____
Female _____

4. What is your age?

29 or younger _____
30 to 39 _____
40 to 49 _____
50 to 59 _____
60 or older _____

5. What is your ethnic background?

Caucasian _____
Black _____
Hispanic _____
Other _____

6. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

Bachelor's Degree _____
Master's Degree _____
Doctorate _____
Other _____

6305 Prentice Drive
Downers Grove, IL 60516
July 20, 1993

Dr. Willis Furtwengler
Research and Service Institute, Inc.
7407 Magill
Wichita, Kansas 67206

Dear Dr. Furtwengler:

I am a student at Loyola University in Chicago pursuing an Ed.D. in Education Administration and writing a dissertation on whether gender makes a difference in discipline effectiveness.

After reading your excellent book, Improving School Discipline: An Administrator's Guide, I am most interested in measuring the discipline effectiveness of female deans and male deans. I will be surveying teacher in several suburban high schools in Illinois which employ at least one male dean and at least one female dean. My thought is to use your "Basic Leadership Profile", asking teaching to complete Form I (Expectations) once and Form II (Perceptions) twice, once with regard to the female dean in their school and a second time with regard to the male dean.

My purpose in writing this letter is twofold: 1) to ask your permission to use your survey instrument, and 2) to ask for clarification on scoring the survey. In addition, any comments or suggestions you may have on the nature and scope of my study would be greatly appreciated. You would certainly be welcome to my research results.

You may contact me at the above address or at the following telephone number: (78) 451-3121 or (708) 969-1602. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kathryn J. Robbins

RESEARCH AND SERVICE INSTITUTE, INC.

153

7407 Magill

Wichita, Kansas 67206

(316) 634-1871

FAX & Modem (316) 634-1873



January 18, 1994

Ms. Kathy Robbins
6305 Prentice Drive
Downers Grove, IL 60516

Dear Kathy:

Enclosed is a copy of the published version of the Hurst dissertation. I hope this is helpful. You have my permission to duplicate and use copies of the RSI Basic Leadership Profile for your study.

I would be happy to assist you with the response cards and analysis if you desire. Please plan to share the results and a copy of the data with me after you have completed your study.

Best of luck in your research work.

Sincerely,

Bill Furtwengler
President

Basic Leadership Inventory Part I Expectations

Copyright 1992 Willis J. Furtwengler

This inventory asks you to identify **your expectations for the specific position** that the person occupies. Respond to each item according to the statement that best represents your expectations. Record the corresponding letter code on the accompanying response card. Use a # 2 black lead pencil.

A = Very much like the descriptor on the left

B = More like the descriptor on the left than the one on the right

C = A balance between the descriptors on the left and right

D = More like the descriptor on the right than the one on the left

E = Very much like the descriptor on the right

Example:

I expect a person in this position to:

Make decisions alone A B C ☒ E Share decisions with others

The circled response or darkened letter on the response card indicates that you expect most decisions made by someone in this position to be shared with others.

I expect a person in this position to be:

1. Cheerful, optimistic A B C D E Pessimistic, cynical
2. Persistent A B C D E Not persistent
3. Impersonal, distant A B C D E Warm, caring
4. Aggressive, combative A B C D E Relaxed, not combative
5. Nervous, tense, easily upset A B C D E Calm, composed, not easily upset
6. Unaware of the needs of others A B C D E Sensitive to the needs of others
7. Well informed A B C D E Unaware of important information
8. Patient, lenient A B C D E Demanding, driving
9. Aroused by challenge A B C D E Unaroused by challenge
10. Accepting of other A B C D E Critical of others
11. Open to suggestions A B C D E Closed to suggestions
12. Suspicious of others A B C D E Trusting of others
13. Decisive A B C D E Not decisive

I expect a person in this position to:

14. Identify, solve problems A B C D E Avoid, ignore problems
15. Not plan ahead A B C D E Plan ahead
16. Ignore others A B C D E Listen to others
17. Avoid putting people down A B C D E Put people down
18. Often analyze own behavior A B C D E Seldom analyze own behavior
19. Isolate self from others A B C D E Involve self with others
20. Put things off A B C D E Follow through
21. Not persevere A B C D E Persevere
22. Recognize others' accomplishments A B C D E Ignore the accomplishments of others
23. Let others influence thinking A B C D E Do his/her own thinking
24. Limit growth opportunities for others A B C D E Expand growth opportunities for others
25. Dominate the behavior of others A B C D E Allow others freedom to act

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 26. Resist change, focus on the past | A B C D E | Welcome change, focus on future |
| 27. Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs | A B C D E | Develop others who put their own needs ahead of the welfare of others |
| 28. Discourage others from using their own judgment | A B C D E | Encourage others to trust own judgment |
| 29. Be consistent, and firm in response to misdeeds | A B C D E | Be inconsistent, and not firm in response to misdeeds |
| 30. Not reward others for their appropriate behavior | A B C D E | Reward others for their appropriate behavior |
| 31. Attempt to blame others when problems arise | A B C D E | Not attempt to blame others when problems arise |
| 32. Discourage feedback on own performance | A B C D E | Encourage feedback on own performance |
| 33. Make decisions without others | A B C D E | Share making of decisions with others |
| 34. Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others | A B C D E | Develop others who satisfy their needs by burdening others |
| 35. Not recognize the accomplishments of others | A B C D E | Recognize the accomplishments of others |
| 36. Discourage others from assuming responsibility for solving problems | A B C D E | Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems |

Outcomes that the person (in the designated position) could create and maintain in the organization are listed in this inventory section. Indicate the **extent to which you expect each outcome** to be created and/or maintained by someone in this position by marking your response card with one of these letter codes:

A—Never B—Seldom C—Sometimes D—Usually E—Always

Example:

I expect a person in this position to create and maintain in the organization:

A strong commitment to quality A B C D **(E)**

The circled response indicates that you **expect** the person to **always** create and maintain a strong commitment to quality in the organization.

A person in this position should create and/or maintain among personnel in the organization:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 37. A clear understanding of the aims of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 38. Perceptions that the administrator supports the learning and work activities of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 39. A norm for people to go beyond the "call of duty." | A B C D E |
| 40. Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events. | A B C D E |
| 41. Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 42. Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation. | A B C D E |
| 43. A strong commitment to the aims of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 44. Genuine attention to both detail and quality. | A B C D E |
| 45. Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities. | A B C D E |
| 46. A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself. | A B C D E |
| 47. A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 48. A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement. | A B C D E |
| 49. A strong commitment to use data and information in making decisions. | A B C D E |
| 50. A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school. | A B C D E |

Basic Leadership Inventory Part II Perceptions

Copyright 1992 Willis J. Furtwengler

This inventory asks you to identify **your perceptions of the participant** who occupies the specific position. Respond to each item according to the statement that best represents your views of that person. Record the corresponding letter code on the accompanying response card. Use a # 2 black lead pencil.

A = Very much like the descriptor on the left

B = More like the descriptor on the left than the one on the right

C = A balance between the descriptors on the left and right

D = More like the descriptor on the right than the one on the left

E = Very much like the descriptor on the right

Example:

I believe that the participant does:

Make decisions alone A B C **D** E Share decisions with others

The circled response or darkened letter on the response card indicates that you believe that most decisions made by the participant are shared with others.

I believe that the participant is:

1. Cheerful, optimistic A B C D E Pessimistic, cynical
2. Persistent A B C D E Not persistent
3. Impersonal, distant A B C D E Warm, caring
4. Aggressive, combative A B C D E Relaxed, not combative
5. Nervous, tense, easily upset A B C D E Calm, composed, not easily upset
6. Unaware of the needs of others A B C D E Sensitive to the needs of others
7. Well informed A B C D E Unaware of important information
8. Patient, lenient A B C D E Demanding, driving
9. Aroused by challenge A B C D E Unaroused by challenge
10. Accepting of other A B C D E Critical of others
11. Open to suggestions A B C D E Closed to suggestions
12. Suspicious of others A B C D E Trusting of others
13. Decisive A B C D E Not decisive

I believe that the participant does:

14. Identify, solve problems A B C D E Avoid, ignore problems
15. Not plan ahead A B C D E Plan ahead
16. Ignore others A B C D E Listen to others
17. Avoid putting people down A B C D E Put people down
18. Often analyze own behavior A B C D E Seldom analyze own behavior
19. Isolate self from others A B C D E Involve self with others
20. Put things off A B C D E Follow through
21. Not persevere A B C D E Persevere
22. Recognize others' accomplishments A B C D E Ignore the accomplishments of others
23. Let others influence thinking A B C D E Do his/her own thinking
24. Limit growth opportunities for others A B C D E Expand growth opportunities for others
25. Dominate the behavior of others A B C D E Allow others freedom to act

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 26. Resist change, focus on the past | A B C D E | Welcome change, focus on future |
| 27. Develop others who put the welfare of others ahead of their own needs | A B C D E | Develop others who put their own needs ahead of the welfare of others |
| 28. Discourage others from using their own judgment | A B C D E | Encourage others to trust own judgment |
| 29. Be consistent, and firm in response to misdeeds | A B C D E | Be inconsistent, and not firm in response to misdeeds |
| 30. Not reward others for their appropriate behavior | A B C D E | Reward others for their appropriate behavior |
| 31. Attempt to blame others when problems arise | A B C D E | Not attempt to blame others when problems arise |
| 32. Discourage feedback on own performance | A B C D E | Encourage feedback on own performance |
| 33. Make decisions without others | A B C D E | Share making of decisions with others |
| 34. Develop those who satisfy their needs without burdening others | A B C D E | Develop others who satisfy their needs by burdening others |
| 35. Not recognize the accomplishments of others | A B C D E | Recognize the accomplishments of others |
| 36. Discourage others from assuming responsibility for solving problems | A B C D E | Encourage others to assume responsibility for solving problems |

Outcomes that the person (in the designated position) could create and maintain in the organization are listed in this inventory section. Indicate the **extent to which you believe each outcome** is created and/or maintained by the person by marking your response card with one of these letter codes:

A—Never B—Seldom C—Sometimes D—Usually E—Always

Example:

I believe that the participant creates and maintains:

A strong commitment to quality A B C D **E**

The circled response indicates that **you believe** that the participant **always** creates and maintains a strong commitment to quality in the organization.

The person creates and/or maintains among personnel in the organization:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 37. A clear understanding of the aims of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 38. Perceptions that the administrator supports the learning and work activities of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 39. A norm for people to go beyond the "call of duty." | A B C D E |
| 40. Consistency in the handling of day-to-day events. | A B C D E |
| 41. Feelings that everyone is a part of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 42. Pockets in the organization for innovation and experimentation. | A B C D E |
| 43. A strong commitment to the aims of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 44. Genuine attention to both detail and quality. | A B C D E |
| 45. Resources for the support of day-to-day staff activities. | A B C D E |
| 46. A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of oneself. | A B C D E |
| 47. A strong commitment to the continuous improvement of the organization. | A B C D E |
| 48. A belief that continuous feedback is necessary for improvement. | A B C D E |
| 49. A strong commitment to use data and information in making decisions. | A B C D E |
| 50. A belief that student learning outcomes are the primary purposes of the school. | A B C D E |

August 3, 1993

Name of Principal
Name of School
Address of School
City, State

Dear Principal:

I am currently employed as Assistant Principal at West Leyden High School; however, as a former classroom teacher at Proviso East High School and then as a dean at Glenbard West High School, I became intrigued by the issue of the discipline effectiveness of female deans. I am pursuing an Ed.D. through Loyola University, and my dissertation will attempt to determine whether gender plays a part in discipline effectiveness.

I understand that your school employs at least one male and at least one female dean. Since this makes your school part of a small yet elite group, I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to survey approximately 50 of your faculty members (chosen randomly). My plan is to distribute the survey, which is attached for your perusal, in late September. I will use no names of participating districts or individual respondents in my dissertation.

I will call you during the week of August 9 to see if you are willing to allow your school to participate in the survey. Should you wish to contact me, you may reach me at home at (78) 969-1602. During the day, you may reach me at (78) 451-3121.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Robbins

Attachment

6305 Prentice Drive
Downers Grove, IL 60516
October 5, 1993

Name of Principal
Name of School
Address of School
City, State

Dear Principal:

Enclosed are 50 copies of my dissertation survey on the subject of female and male deans' effectiveness. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to survey your faculty. Please distribute the surveys randomly among your faculty members; my only request is to please distribute them to 25 female faculty members and 25 male faculty members. Each survey has a cover letter with instructions.

I have asked the respondents to return the surveys to your office by Friday, October 15. I will make arrangements to pick them up. Please be assured that I will use no individual or district names in my dissertation.

Thank you so much for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kathryn J. Robbins

Enclosures

October 5, 1993

Dear Faculty Member:

I am a doctoral student at Loyola University writing my dissertation on whether gender makes a difference in the effectiveness of the secondary school dean. Your principal, Name of Principal, has been kind enough to allow me to survey 50 faculty members at your school; you have been randomly selected as one of the 50 respondents. Since the number of schools with female and male deans is rather limited, your response is critical and greatly appreciated.

Attached is the survey instrument. It begins with a few questions of a demographic nature; the next three pages contain the same 50 questions repeated three times. When you answer the questions on the yellow page, ask yourself "What are my expectations of someone in a dean's role?" Try to be gender-neutral as you answer. On the pink page, please answer the same 50 questions while considering your perceptions of the female dean in your school, Name of Female Dean. On the blue page, answer the same 50 questions considering your perceptions of your school's male dean, Name of Male Dean. In all cases, please respond in terms of discipline effectiveness.

When you complete the survey, please return it to your principal's office by Friday, October 15. Your responses are completely confidential as I will use no names of participating districts or individual respondents in my dissertation.

Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Robbins

6305 Prentice Drive
Downers Grove, IL 60516
November 8, 1993

Name of Principal
Name of School
Address of School
City, State

Dear Principal:

Thank you so much for allowing me to survey a portion of your faculty for my dissertation on gender and discipline effectiveness. I appreciate greatly your cooperation and assistance in getting me one step closer to completing my doctorate from Loyola.

I am anxious to compile the results from all the school involved. If you would like the results from your school or from the complete study, I will be happy to supply you with them. Again, be assured that I will use no individual or district names in the dissertation.

Thanks again, Principal.

Sincerely,

Kathryn J. Robbins

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kathryn Jane Robbins has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Max Bailey
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Philip Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation, and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 15, 1994
Date

L. Arthur Safer
Director's Signature